

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

**23 OCTOBER 2007
CITY HALL, ROOM 578
9:30 A.M.**

PRESENT

Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA
Dan McCoubrey, AIA
Vincent Rivera
Daniela Voith
Rudy D'Alessandro
Herb Levy

Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

ALSO PRESENT

Seth Cohen, Venturi Scott Brown & Associates
Elizabeth Warshawer, Curtis Institute
Peter Dobrin, Inquirer
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
John McFellen, Curtis Institute
Patrick Pasquariello
Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers, LLP
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents Association
George Thomas
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Neil Montgomery
Richard DeMarco, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers, LLP
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Neil Sklaroff, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP
Stephen Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Ana L. Pesce
Kevin Kaminski, Venturi Scott Brown & Associates
Sandra Tatman, Athenaeum
Roger Moss, Athenaeum
Matt McClure, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP
Carey Yonce, Venturi Scott Brown & Associates
Craig Schelter, Schelter & Associates
David Brill
Larry Silver, Esq., Langstrom, Stevens & Silver, LLP
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
E. Oxman
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Partners
Michael Fettner, Lyman & Ash

Jack Dundon, Alesker & Dundon, LLC
Joe Schiavo, Old City Civic Association
Janet Kalter, Old City Civic Association
Sam Olshin, Atkin Olshin & Schade Architects
Tony Forte, Esq., Saul Ewing, LLP
Tom Lussenhop
David Hollenberg, University of Pennsylvania
Esaul Sanchez, University of Pennsylvania
Paul Sehnert, University of Pennsylvania
Glenn Moyer
Melani Lamond
Belynda Stewart
Karen Allen
Ofer Joe Noga, Property Locators, Inc
Greg Donofrio, Cornell University
Barry Grossback, Spruce Hill
Steven Singer, Danad Inc, Singer Jewelers
Joe Poeller
Anthony Miksitz, Architect
Kevin Ryan
Barry Spector
Richard Thom, Old City Civic Association
Laura Siena, West Mt. Airy Neighbors
Stephen Humeniuk, Warren Lightning Rod Company
Bruce Cooper, Jake's Restaurant
Dolores Lyons, Mother Bethel Church
Van Strother, New Covenant Church
Shawn Evans, Atkin Olshin & Schade Architects
Serena Rose Overton, Stuart Rosenberg Architects
Greg Mastalerz, Stuart Rosenberg Architect
Brian Tracy, BKT Architects
Rebecca Pickens, BKT Architects
H. Levinson, MDC
Ivano D'Angella, IDA
Richard Donaghy
Karen Weldon

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Rivera called the meeting to order at 9:42 a.m. Messrs. Thomas and Levy joined him. Mses. Voith and Pentz and Messrs. D'Alessandro and McCoubrey joined the Architectural Committee later in the meeting.

1610, 1612-1616, AND 1618 LOCUST STREET

Owner: HFGLocust LP, The Lenfest Group LLC, H. F. Gerry Lenfest, Curtis Institute

Applicant: Seth Cohen, Venturi Scott Brown Associates

History: 1610: 1893, John H. Converse House, Wilson Brothers, architects

Individually designated 2/28/67, Significant in district

1612-1616: c. 1960, Non-contributing in district

1618: c. 1855, Charles Custis Harrison House, John Notman, architect
new façade, Wilson Eyre, architect, 1888

Significant in district

Project: In concept - demolish all but 1610 and 1618 facades, construct 10-story music and dormitory building; restore historic facades

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to demolish the entirety of the Non-contributing building at 1612-1616 Locust Street and all but the front facades of the Significant buildings at 1610 and 1618 Locust Street. In their places, it proposes to construct a ten-story building to house practice spaces and residences for students and faculty of the Curtis Institute, a music school located on the 1700-block of Locust Street. It also proposes to fully restore the historic brownstone facades at 1610 and 1618.

The in-concept application proposes the demolition of all but the front facades of the nineteenth-century rowhouses flanking the non-historic building. Both historic buildings have architecturally significant brownstone front facades. Both also have altered, relatively insignificant, rear facades. The rear at 1610 was extensively added to and altered in 1939. It is currently in poor condition. The rear at 1618 was altered in the 1960s with the addition of a stair tower for the Locust Club and the infilling and altering of many openings.

The new building would present a four-story façade on Locust Street that would incorporate the two historic facades. The new facade would align with the cornices lines and planes of the historic facades, restoring the street wall lost with the construction of the Locust Club building in the 1960s. The six-story residential tower would be set atop the four-story base about 45 feet back from the front façade. Photomontages demonstrate that the tower would be inconspicuous from Locust Street. At the rear, the building would rise ten stories from Latimer Street. The building would house offices, a dining hall and kitchen, a student lounge, and a loading dock accessed from Latimer on the first floor. The loading-dock driveway would double as a drop-off lane. A three-story rehearsal room large enough to accommodate a full orchestra would dominate the second, third, and fourth floors. Those floors would also house practice, teaching, recording, and instrument storage rooms. Dormitory rooms would be located at the rear at the third to ninth floors. The tenth floor would house visiting faculty apartments.

This application was listed on the agendas of the Architectural Committee and Commission for the meeting of 25 September and 12 October 2007, respectively. At that Committee meeting, two Committee members recused, owing to their involvements with the project, leaving the Committee without a quorum. Ms. Voith and Mr. Thomas reviewed the project without a quorum, but could not offer a true recommendation. In response to the advice of the two Committee members, the applicants submitted supplementary information prior to the October Commission meeting. At the October Commission meeting, the applicants requested that the Commission continue the application for one month to the November meeting to give the Architectural Committee an opportunity to review the supplementary material and make a true recommendation.

The demolitions of all but the facades of the buildings at 1610 and 1618 must be considered “demolitions” under the historic preservation ordinance. Therefore, the Commission cannot approve these demolitions without first finding that the buildings cannot be reasonably adapted for any purpose or that the demolitions are necessary in the public interest. The application does not advance a financial hardship claim, but does advance a public interest claim. That claim is elaborated in a Memorandum of Law and accompanying affidavit from Elizabeth Warshawer, the executive vice president of the Curtis Institute.

The Commission’s ordinance and Rules & Regulations provide little guidance for evaluating or substantiating “necessary in the public interest” claims. The Commission’s past practice regarding demolition deemed necessary in the public interest provides some guidance. The Commission has found that demolitions were necessary in the public interest in four instances since the adoption of the new historic preservation ordinance in 1985. In 1991, the Commission found that the demolition of Smith Hall, a research building at the University of Pennsylvania, was necessary in the public interest. In 2001, the Commission found that the demolition of an individually designated house was necessary in the public interest for the expansion of the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf at the former Germantown Academy. In 2002 (in concept) and 2006 (final), the Commission found that the demolition of a firehouse in the path of the expansion of the Convention Center was necessary in the public interest. In 2003, the Commission found that the demolition of three buildings to clear a site for a parking garage on the 1900-block of Walnut and Sansom Streets was necessary in the public interest; however, the parking-garage decision was overturned on appeal. In his Memorandum Opinion in the parking-garage case, Judge Carrafiello stated that “it is incomprehensible that ‘necessary in the public interest,’ used in the context of a grant of power to save historic buildings from the ravages of modern development, would mean allowing development purely for economic gain.”

The Smith Hall and Pennsylvania School for the Deaf decisions are especially germane to the current case. In both instances, the Commission found that the demolitions were necessary for the important, non-profit, educational institutions to provide or continue to provide significant public benefits. In their Memorandum of Law, the Curtis applicants claim that the Institute currently provides a significant public benefit to the city and beyond. More importantly, the applicants also claim that the realization of the proposed rehearsal and residential building is critical to advancement of the music school and its continued provision of significant public benefit. Without the new building, the school will falter and the city will lose one of its most important cultural institutions. Furthermore, the Memorandum claims that the proposed building cannot be redesigned to both avoid demolishing the historic buildings and meet the Institute’s minimum needs.

Geography is also important in this case. The Curtis Institute’s options for expansion are limited by its commitment to its current location. In the Smith Hall and Pennsylvania School for the Deaf cases, the options to expand the institutions were also limited owing to the institutions’ investments in and commitments to their established campuses. The Race Street firehouse case is also relevant in this regard; the Commission agreed that, owing to its investment in its location, the Convention Center Authority was not free to relocate, but was extremely limited in its expansion options. In all three cases, the identifications of significant public benefits provided by the institutions established the “public interest,” but the geographical limitations, combined with the critical programmatic needs, established the “necessity” required by the ordinance. The Curtis application presents a similar claim of necessity. The music school has occupied buildings at the corner of 18th and Locust Streets, one block from the site under discussion, since 1924. The Curtis Institute undertook a study of potential sites for expansion around its campus, which is summarized in the Curtis Facilities Evaluation, Exhibit A of the Memorandum

of Law. In the Study, the site and program requirements used to evaluate several potential sites are listed and the results of the evaluations are presented. The document explains that the Curtis evaluated 14 sites in addition to the Locust Club site. The evaluators concluded that each of the 14 potential sites were not viable; some were too expensive, some too small, some not available, and some surrounded by oppositional neighbors. The evaluation concludes that the parcels at 1610-1618 Locust Street are "the most practical locations to accommodate Curtis's programmatic needs." An aerial photograph also included in the application demonstrates that the proposed site is convenient to three points frequented by Curtis students and faculty: the current Curtis buildings, the Academy of Music, and the Kimmel Center.

The applicants claim that the historic rowhouses cannot be integrated into their larger development, owing to floor levels, acoustic and structural requirements, and other restrictions. The application includes an extensive report documenting alternate designs that would preserve more historic fabric. For example, to save the two front rooms of 1610 would result in significant losses of space, especially in the rehearsal hall, create extensive program losses, require extensive ramping between floors, and produce undesirable spatial relationships and other conditions. Moreover, the historic rooms would not have sufficient structural capacity, acoustical isolation, or ceiling heights. The report also includes a synopsis of the initial and realized programs. This synopsis demonstrates that the proposed program for the building has been significantly reduced by the architects since it was first elaborated by the Institute. Most importantly, it demonstrates that the rehearsal hall has been reduced from the proposed 4000 sf to 3500 sf; the student suites have been reduced from 25 to 22; the staff apartment has been eliminated; the visiting faculty apartment space has been reduced from 2055 sf to 1680 sf; and the student services, communications, and development offices have been eliminated entirely. The applicants claim that the program cannot be reduced any further. The report also includes materials from the structural, acoustic, and fire-code compliance engineering consultants on the project. The acoustic engineer claims that the framing in the historic rowhouses would not provide adequate sound isolation or vibration control. The structural engineer claims that the structural systems in the rowhouses would not provide sufficient acoustical separation or load capacity. He also claims that retaining sections of the rowhouses would require complicated and expensive seismic joints and underpinnings. The fire safety engineer concludes that the wood-frame construction of the historic rowhouses does not comply with the noncombustible-construction requirements of high-rise construction.

Interpretations of "necessary in the public interest" in other jurisdictions may provide additional guidance for the review of this application. In some municipal preservation ordinances, projects that are "necessary in the public interest" are sometimes referred to as "projects of special merit." The Portland, Maine ordinance (§14-625) is illustrative. It states that a project shall not be designated as a project of special merit unless:

1. The project is consistent with the comprehensive plan...;
2. The project will provide significant public and civic benefits, including without limitation social or other benefits which are significant to the community, and particularly desirable at the location proposed. Such benefits must substantially outweigh the loss of the ... landmark. Such benefit shall not be considered principally on the basis of economic development, property taxes, or other financial return to the city or other parties;
3. The project is of exceptional design, utilizing the highest quality of exterior materials in a manner compatible with the surrounding area, including without limitation any remaining landmark, district, or any portion thereof; and
4. If demolition of a landmark structure or contributing structure is required, reasonable efforts have been to made relocate the structure.

If a project is deemed a project of special merit, the Portland ordinance requires that the demolition permit not issue until the new construction permit issues; binding assurances that the project will be completed are provided by the developer; photographs and measured drawings of the lost resource are submitted to the city; and the lost resource is commemorated with a suitable monument that is prominently and perpetually displayed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE:

1. The staff recommends that the demolitions of all but the facades of 1610 and 1618 Locust Street are demolitions in significant part and trigger the hardship/public interest test in §14-2007(7)(j). The applicants have offered a “necessary in the public interest” claim to justify the demolitions. The staff recommends that the Committee acknowledge the public interest claim, but not opine on its merits. Pursuant to §6.3.d.4 of the Rules & Regulations, the staff will enter a recommendation directly to the Commission on the merits of the public interest claim.
2. The staff recommends that the applicants have presented sufficient evidence to support the conclusion that the site at 1610-1618 Locust Street is the only viable site in the proximity of the current Curtis Institute buildings that can reasonably accommodate the school’s programmatic needs.
3. The staff recommends that the applicants have presented sufficient architectural, acoustic, structural, and code-compliance evidence to support their claim that the minimum program cannot be reasonably accommodated on the site without demolishing all but the front facades of the buildings at 1610 and 1618 Locust Street.
4. The staff recommends that the proposed building is compatible with the character of the historic district, neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape, §14-2007(7)(k)(.4). The staff also recommends that, ignoring the demolition, the proposed building otherwise satisfies the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards because it will 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.
5. The staff recommends the inclusion of the following provisions in any approval of the demolitions of the two historic rowhouses:
 - a. the demolition permit not issue until the new construction permit issues;
 - b. the Curtis Institute provides binding assurances that the project will be completed;
 - c. the Curtis Institute submits photographs and measured drawings of the extant buildings at 1610 and 1618 Locust Street to the Commission;
 - d. the Curtis Institute commemorates 1610 and 1618 Locust Street with a suitable exhibit that is prominently and perpetually displayed; and
 - e. the front facades 1610 and 1618 Locust Street are completely restored to their 1893 and 1888 appearances, respectively.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Elizabeth Warshawer of the Curtis Institute, architect Seth Cohen, and attorney Carl Primavera represented the application.

Messrs. Rivera, Thomas, and Levy of the Committee discussed the staff recommendation and agreed that the Committee should limit its review to those areas within its expertise. They determined that the Committee should consider whether the proposed demolition is a demolition under the City’s historic preservation ordinance; whether the site study proves that this is the only viable site; whether the architectural, engineering, code-compliance, construction, and other studies prove that demolition of the rowhouses is the only viable solution; and whether the

proposed building is compatible with the historic district. They decided that any evaluation of the merits of the claim that the new facilities would allow the Curtis Institute to provide or continue to provide a significant public benefit should be deferred to the Commission meeting.

Mr. Thomas asked the applicants to present an overview of their proposal. Ms. Warshawer outlined the programmatic requirements including the rehearsal hall, which would ideally be 4000 sf, teaching and practice rooms, residences, and dining services. She also noted that the new facility must be in the proximity of the current facilities, Academy of Music, and Kimmel Center. She explained that the site selection committee included board members, faculty, and staff. It visited and studied numerous sites. She stated that the committee rejected other sites because they were not for sale, were cost prohibitive, were not of adequate size, and other reasons. The committee concluded that the 1600-block of Locust site was the only feasible site, provided it included the properties at 1610 and 1618. Mr. Primavera explained why the school wanted one single facility rather than separate rehearsal/teaching space and residential space. He stated that students must have access to practice space 24 hours a day and seven days a week. The practice spaces must be close to their residences because they must transport instruments, some of which are large. He stated that the students also need the security provided by a single location. Ms. Warshawer added that accrediting agencies have noted the school's lack of adequate facilities. She stated that it is becoming more and more difficult for the Curtis Institute to compete for the best students because of the school's deficient facilities. She stated that they are losing some of the best students to schools with better practice and residential facilities like the Colburn School in Los Angeles.

Ms. Voith arrived and joined the Committee. She stated that she is convinced that the Curtis needs these new facilities. She asked the applicants to present their claim that the new facilities would allow the Curtis Institute to provide or continue to provide a significant public benefit. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee had already discussed the bounds of its review and determined that it should limit its discussion to its areas of expertise. He suggested that any evaluation of the public interest claim should be considered by the Commission. Ms. Voith disagreed and asked Ms. Warshawer to present her public interest case. Ms. Warshawer quickly summarized the case. She stated that the Curtis Institute provides a great social, cultural, and economic benefit to Philadelphia and beyond. She also reported that the Institute has significant public outreach programs. The Institute provides accessible, affordable music to Philadelphians. She stated that, with increased competition from other top schools, Curtis risks slipping from its leading position. If it slips, it will lose its ability to provide great and unique benefits to the city. Therefore, the new facilities are necessary if the Institute is to continue to provide it significant public benefits.

Mr. Cohen presented his plan for the new building as well as the reasoning behind its design. Beginning with the site, he explained that there are many larger towers than his proposed tower in the immediate neighborhood. He stated that Locust Street is lined with front facades, but Latimer has front facades on the south and rear facades on the north. He would like to elevate the quality of the north side of the block. He is proposing front facades on both Locust and Latimer. He will create a drop-off and social area on Latimer. He explained that a main corridor will run through the building, connecting Locust and Latimer. Inside the building, the first floor will be devoted to social spaces including the dining hall. The second floor will house the large rehearsal hall and practice and instrument storage spaces. The third floor will house teaching and practice spaces at the front and residential spaces at the rear. The remainder of the building will be residential, with dorm rooms on floors four to nine and visiting faculty apartments on the tenth floor. Ms. Warshawer noted that the rehearsal hall had been reduced in size from 4000 sf to 3500 sf, the absolute minimum. Mr. Cohen stated that the basement would house

practice rooms and a library. He stated that the structural system would be cast-in-place concrete and the floor slabs would be 10 inches thick for acoustical isolation. He stated that he had reduced the height of the building by 18 feet after conversations with the neighbors. He stated that he had compressed the floor-to-ceiling heights; the music rooms are now 12'-6", the absolute minimum. Moving to the elevations, he explained that he is proposing to retain the front facades of 1610 and 1618 and fully restore them. He stated that the rhythm of the windows in the new building would echo the rhythms of the historic townhouses that once stood on the Locust Club site. He stated that the proposed bay over the door would echo the historic bays on the block. He asserted that the tower would be inconspicuous from Locust Street. He noted that he would acknowledge the scale of the Latimer Street buildings by cladding the lower part of the tower in brick. Mr. Cohen presented a chart showing the program as specified by the client and as realized in his design. He stated that he had pared the program to its absolute minimum. He added that the construction of the new building would significantly reduce the pressure placed on the other Curtis buildings, which are also designated as historic. Mr. Rivera asked him if the school planned to continue to occupy its current facilities. Mr. Cohen stated that the Curtis absolutely planned to continue to occupy its current facilities.

Mr. Cohen presented his reasons for requesting approval of the demolition of the rowhouses. He showed diagrams of the proposed building with the footprints of 1610 and 1618 overlaid on it. He asserted that he could not accommodate the minimum program with encroaching onto the two rowhouse sites. He showed sections with the various floor heights demarcated and claimed that the floor heights were not compatible. He noted that 1618 is gutted. He stated that the historic floor-to-floor heights are not compatible with the new uses or construction. He claimed that the old buildings would not satisfy the acoustic, structural, or life-safety requirements. He reported that, if reused, the interiors of the old buildings would need to be modified so extensively that all historic features such as plaster ceilings would be lost. He stated that ductwork and other temperature and humidity control mechanisms would not be compatible with the old buildings. He stated that the old structural systems could not support the new loads, even for instrument storage. He would need to underpin the foundations, making the planned basement spaces infeasible. The old buildings would not meet the life safety codes for a high-rise residential building.

He discussed the options considered during the design phase. The first option was rotating the rehearsal hall to save the interior of 1610. If rotated 90 degrees, the rehearsal hall would become too small to meet its requirement to house a full orchestra. The percussion studio and other needed spaces would be lost as well. A series of ramps would be needed, making the circulation less efficient and consuming needed space. The rehearsal hall would project under the tower, making the structural system more complicated and expensive. The acoustics would suffer. And, finally, there would be no uses for the spaces on the upper floors of the preserved portion of the historic building. The second option called for flipping the plan and moving the rehearsal hall to the west. Mr. Cohen explained that the rehearsal hall would be even further reduced in size in this plan. He concluded that he cannot house the minimum program and retain the 1610 and 1618 buildings. He committed to fully restoring the two historic rowhouse facades.

Mr. Levy asked about the interior of 1618. Mr. Cohen explained that it was gutted years ago. There is nothing left in the interior. Mr. Thomas noted that all of the information presented by Mr. Cohen was also provided as written reports to the Commission.

Mr. Thomas invited the audience to speak. Ana Pesce explained that she is a tenant in 1610 Locust. She rents space for her business. She stated that she is opposed to the demolition. She

held up the Historical Commission plaque for the property as evidence of its designation. She stated that she is very interested in history and historic buildings. She asked the Committee to recommend denial of the application.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that he believes that the Curtis Institute needs more and better facilities. However, he asserted that the Curtis can achieve its goals and also preserve 1610. He presented his definition of “necessary” in “necessary in the public interest.” He contended that necessary means essential. He stated that the demolition is not essential for the Curtis to meet its goals. He discussed proximity, agreeing that Curtis must develop new facilities close to their current facilities. He distributed a map of the area with every site considered by the Curtis marked with a dot. He drew a circle around the considered sites and defined the area within it as the “zone of proximity.” He claimed that the Curtis had not considered one potential site within the zone, the surface parking lot at 17th and Pine Streets. He claimed that it was a better site because it is larger, more affordable, and would be cheaper to build on. He claimed that Mr. Cohen had admitted that the Locust site would be very costly to build on. He suggested that the Curtis develop its music space on the 1600 block of Locust and its residential spaces on the 1700 block of Pine. Changing subjects, he asserted that, for relief under the public interest clause, the project must be necessary in the public interest; proving that the institution provides a public benefit is not sufficient. He claimed that the dormitory and practice spaces would be for out-of-state students; it would not provide any benefit to Philadelphians. He stated that the public interest approval for the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf was appropriate because the new facility provides education for deaf Philadelphians. He commended the Venturi Scott Brown design, but requested some changes. He stated that the Curtis Institute sign proposed for the Locust Street façade was not appropriate because it was too horizontal. He stated that the rear façade is “not friendly” and needs work.

Michael Fettner, who represents a law firm located on the 1600 block of Latimer, submitted a long letter detailing his firm’s opposition. He stated that the proposed building would be too large. He objected to the loading dock on Latimer. He suggested that other, more appropriate sites are available.

Objecting to Mr. Gallery’s earlier characterization of his discussion of the construction costs, Mr. Cohen stated that the proposed design would not have cost penalties associated with it. He corrected Mr. Gallery, stating that only the alternate designs that would avoid the historic building at 1610 would have cost penalties associated with it. He reminded the Committee that his application is for approval in concept, not final approval. He contended that Mr. Gallery’s comments about the design assumed a final approval level of detailing. Mr. Cohen explained that the architects would continue to develop the design; one should not conclude that the detailing is finalized. Mr. Cohen also defended the design for the Latimer Street façade; he asserted that it is not flat, as Mr. Gallery had claimed, but is articulated at the entranceway and at the upper floors.

Ms. Warshawer stated that it would be infeasible to split the program as Mr. Gallery had proposed, locating the rehearsal spaces on Locust and the residential spaces on Pine. She offered two primary reasons for her assertion. First, it would be infeasible from development cost and maintenance cost perspectives to build and maintain two separate facilities. Second, two facilities would not achieve the stated goals of developing a socializing environment and of locating the rehearsal and living spaces together to promote round-the-clock practice.

Mr. Thomas stated that he believes that splitting the program between two disparate locations is not feasible. However, he asked the applicants if they had considered the parcel at the corner of

17th and Pine Streets identified by Mr. Gallery. Ms. Warshawer stated that the committee had considered it, but had found that it was not available. Mr. Gallery interrupted Ms. Warshawer and demanded to know why it was not included in the site selection committee's report if it had been considered. Mr. Primavera reiterated that it was not available. He added that it was not close enough to the existing facilities. He stated that the Locust Street location was perfect; it was on the axis running from the existing facilities to the Academy of Music. Ms. Warshawer and Messrs. Cohen and Primavera emphasized that the Curtis Institute is committed and connected to Locust Street. Ms. Warshawer added that a "very generous donor" has already purchased the site on Locust. Mr. Levy stated that, regardless of the level of comprehensiveness of the site selection survey, someone will always suggest another site. He stated that it is very difficult to determine whether a site is available and at what price without entering into serious negotiations. He rejected Mr. Gallery's suggestion of the site at 17th and Pine as unsubstantiated.

Mr. Gallery countered Ms. Warshawer's assertion that a donor has already purchased the site, contending that the Institute could simply sell the site and use the proceeds to purchase a more appropriate one. Mr. Gallery stated that the Committee must determine that there is no other feasible site available for this development. Mr. Gallery added that the Committee does not know whether the site at 17th and Pine is available. The Committee should not recommend approval of this project until the applicant has proven that the 17th and Pine site is not feasible. He also asserted again that the construction would be less expensive on the 17th and Pine site. Mr. Primavera and Ms. Warshawer explained the terms of the gift agreement for the property on Locust. It is currently held in trust for the Curtis by the donor. They stated that there is no provision in the gift agreement to sell the property. Mr. Primavera stated that his application materials are not anecdotal; they are presented in a notarized affidavit. He stated that several of the board members who participated on the site selection committee are very knowledgeable about Center City real estate. He concluded that they were prudent, professional, and thorough. He suggested that Mr. Gallery's claims about the site at 17th and Pine are anecdotal.

Mr. Levy suggested that the Committee recommend approval of the proposal in concept. He stated that "this is the scheme that should be followed." Mr. Thomas agreed. He rejected the viability of the 17th and Pine owing especially to proximity. He stated that the location on Locust is very important. He agreed with the staff that the matter of public interest should be addressed by the Commission. Ms. Voith suggested to the applicants that they explain to the Commission why the proposed building, as opposed to the institution itself, would provide benefits in the public interest. She suggested additional investigation to determine if interior elements such as mantels could be preserved. She suggested that the architect rethink the sign, which she characterized as uni-directional. She concluded that the massing is "superb" and the presentation was "excellent." She stated that this project should not be delayed because "someone is picking sites out of a hat." Mr. Farnham asked the Committee if it was concurring with the staff recommendation. The members agreed that they were.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend that:

1. the demolitions of all but the facades of 1610 and 1618 Locust Street are demolitions in significant part and trigger the hardship/public interest test in §14-2007(7)(j). The applicants have offered a "necessary in the public interest" claim to justify the demolitions. The Committee acknowledged the public interest claim, but did not opine on its merits.

2. the applicants have presented sufficient evidence to support the conclusion that the site at 1610-1618 Locust Street is the only viable site in the proximity of the current Curtis Institute buildings that can reasonably accommodate the school's programmatic needs.
3. the applicants have presented sufficient architectural, acoustic, structural, and code-compliance evidence to support their claim that the minimum program cannot be reasonably accommodated on the site without demolishing all but the front facades of the buildings at 1610 and 1618 Locust Street.
4. the proposed building is compatible with the character of the historic district, neighboring structures, the surroundings, and the streetscape, §14-2007(7)(k)(.4). Ignoring the demolition, the proposed building otherwise satisfies the Secretary of the Interior's Standards because it will 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.
5. the following provisions are included in any approval of the demolitions of the two historic rowhouses:
 - f. the demolition permit not issue until the new construction permit issues;
 - g. the Curtis Institute provides binding assurances that the project will be completed;
 - h. the Curtis Institute submits photographs and measured drawings of the extant buildings at 1610 and 1618 Locust Street to the Commission;
 - i. the Curtis Institute commemorates 1610 and 1618 Locust Street with a suitable exhibit that is prominently and perpetually displayed; and
 - j. the front facades 1610 and 1618 Locust Street are completely restored to their 1893 and 1888 appearances, respectively.

223-225 S. 6TH STREET

Owner: John J. and Mary Elizabeth Turchi

Applicant: Neil Sklaroff, Esq.

History: 1956-1957, architect G. Edwin Brumbaugh for Mayor Richardson and Anne Dilworth

Project: Remove rear and side wings, construct 16-story building

OVERVIEW: This application for final approval proposes to demolish the side and rear wings and retain the main block of the former home of Mayor Richardson Dilworth, which is listed as significant in the Society Hill Historic District. It also proposes to construct a mid-rise residential building behind the remaining section of the historic building. The new building would connect to and wrap around the historic building at the north and east. It would also cantilever over the rear of the historic building. The application also proposes the addition of a doorway in the south wall of the Athenaeum building to the north to access a storage area in the condominium building.

The Commission approved an in-concept version of this application in September 2006. At that time, the Commission explicitly determined that the proposed demolition is not a "demolition in significant part" and therefore does not require a finding of financial hardship or necessity in the public interest for approval. In-concept approvals are valid for one year. In September 2007, before the September 2006 in-concept approval expired, the applicant requested and received an extension of the approval in concept for six months to March 2008. The project currently proposed is consistent with the project approved in concept in 2006.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Commission's approval in concept of September 2006, provided the additional information demonstrates that the surviving historic resources at the 223-225 S. 6th Street will be treated in accordance with historic preservation

standards. The proposal for the alterations to the Athenaeum building should be submitted as a separate application.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner John Turchi, attorneys Matt McClure and Neil Sklaroff, architect Carey Yonce, consultants Craig Shelter and George Thomas, and Roger Moss and Sandra Tatman of the Athenaeum represented the application.

Mr. Farnham acknowledged the claims by some interested parties that the application is incomplete and suggested that the Architectural Committee address the question of completeness before considering the merits of this application. He informed the Committee that Section 6.3.a of the of the Commission's Rules & Regulations authorizes the Committee to reject any application it deems incomplete and direct the staff to return it to the applicant. He noted that three interested parties, the Preservation Alliance, Society Hill Civic Association, and an attorney representing neighbors to the south all contend that the application is incomplete. He stated that they incorrectly claim that the staff considers the application incomplete. The staff considers the application to be deficient, but not incomplete. The staff considers the application as initially submitted on 9 October 2007 to be complete pursuant to Section 6.2 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations. If the staff had deemed the application incomplete, the staff would not have accepted the application or placed it on today's agenda, but would have returned it to the applicant, pursuant to Section 6.3.a of the Rules & Regulations. After reviewing the application, the staff requested additional details from the applicant, not to complete the application, but to augment its understanding of the proposal. The applicant provided those details to the staff yesterday, 22 October 2007. Those details, which were distributed to the Committee at the start of this review and have been available to the public since yesterday, are not, in the staff's opinion, necessary to complete the application. They would be necessary to the staff's final sign-off review, if the Commission were to approve the application. Mr. Farnham summarized Section 6.2 of the Rules and its requirements for a complete application:

1. Section 6.2 requires a complete building permit application, which was submitted.
2. It requires accurately scaled and measured drawings of front side, and rear elevations where the alterations will occur. All drawings must be annotated or be accompanied by complete specifications. He reported that front, side, and rear elevations were originally submitted. He acknowledged that their completeness under the Rules & Regulations is open to debate. The drawings are not annotated, but specifications were submitted.
3. It requires detail drawings of all features to be replaced or reconstructed. Mr. Farnham noted that no replacement or reconstruction of historic features is proposed.
4. It requires photographs of facades and areas where work will take place. He stated that photographs were submitted.
5. It requires a plot or site plan. A plan showing the entire site was submitted.
6. It suggests that a cover letter should be submitted. A cover letter was submitted.

Mr. Farnham concluded that the staff recommends that the application is complete, pursuant to Section 6.2 of the Commission's Rules & Regulations, but suggests that the Committee make its own determination on completeness before proceeding with the review. If the Committee deems the application complete, the staff recommends final approval of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Commission's approval in concept of September 2006. The staff also recommends that the proposal for the alterations to the Athenaeum building be submitted as a separate application.

Mr. McClure asserted that the application was complete as originally submitted. He stated that, in addition to the plans for the proposal, a detailed analysis of all interior and exterior materials

at the historic house was submitted. He asserted that the photographs of the proposed exterior materials provide sufficient information about the cladding of the new building. He stated that his application actually provides more material than the usual application of this sort. He also noted that, in his cover letter, he included the materials submitted to the Commission for the review in concept as part of this application. Mr. McClure commented that a staff review of the details subsequent to an approval would be appropriate. Mr. McClure stated there is nothing in the Rules & Regulations to prevent an applicant from augmenting her application materials; such augmentations are common. He claimed that the assertion by some of the interested parties that the application is incomplete is nothing more than a litigation tactic; he claimed that they are merely seeking to delay the review. He stated that his client should not be punished simply because he provided additional information at the request of the staff, which has asserted that the additional information was not needed to complete the application. Mr. Yonce stated that he believed that he had provided more than the requisite material in his original application. The Committee enumerated the materials submitted with the original application: the application form and cover letter, drawings, photographs of cladding materials, window specifications, preservation analysis report, historical report, and a structural engineering report. Mr. Thomas asked if there was any change to the plans since originally submitted. Mr. McClure stated that there have been no changes. Mr. Levy asked if the Commission had ever requested that the house be documented to HABS standards. Mr. McClure stated that the house has been very thoroughly documented, but the Commission has never required HABS documentation. George Thomas stated that a full set of as-built drawings for the house survive at the Winterthur Museum. Committee member Robert Thomas stated that he considered the application sufficient for review by the Committee.

Attorney Larry Silver, who represents the Preservation Alliance and Society Hill Civic Association, stated he had not received the additional materials. He also noted that the applicant had not provided the original or additional materials to Mr. Gallery for his review; therefore, Mr. Gallery had not had an opportunity to review any of the materials. Mr. McClure stated that, although he was under no obligation to do so, he had provided all of the materials to Paul Boni, Mr. Silver's co-counsel. Mr. Silver strenuously objected, claiming that Mr. Boni was a representative of the Society Hill Civic Association, not his co-counsel.

Mr. Silver described the application as "woefully incomplete" and read an excerpt from the original staff overview of the application. He read:

the current architectural plans, which are very similar to the in-concept plans, do not provide the details necessary for a comprehensive final review. The drawings are not annotated with information such as the proposed materials for the facades; no demolition plan is provided; no elevations of the north, east, and west facades of the remaining section of the historic building are provided; and no details regarding modifications at the rear of the property at the parking entrance are provided. Moreover, the proposed alterations to the Athenaeum building should be submitted as a separate application under the appropriate BRT address. In its recommendation to the Architectural Committee in July 2006 on the proposal that led to the in-concept approval in September 2007, the staff commented that the application materials did not include adequate details to warrant a final review. The July 2006 staff overview stated that:

the application materials ... do not provide the level of detail needed for a final review. They are very similar to those submitted with the two earlier in concept applications. ... Several key details are missing. For example, very few annotations about material and other details are provided on the drawings. More importantly, no detailed north and east elevations are provided for the historic building; drawings should be provided showing how the areas exposed by

demolition would be treated and how the new construction would connect to the historic building.

These comments offered 15 months ago remain valid. The documentation submitted for final review does not provide the Commission and its Committee and staff with the information necessary to determine whether the historic building will be adequately protected and preserved.

Mr. Farnham stated that he had written that staff overview and would interpret it for the Committee. He first noted that the overview, which is not a recommendation, never asserts that the application is incomplete, as Mr. Silver implies it does. Mr. Farnham stated that he considers the application to be deficient in some regards, but not incomplete under the definition of "complete" in the Rules & Regulations. He pointed out that the staff had recommend approval of the application, which it would not have done if it considered it incomplete. Mr. Farnham stated that he would have rejected the application and returned it to Mr. McClure if he had considered it incomplete. He stated that he requested more information to better understand how the architect proposed to treat the exposed portions of the historic building. He stated that he considered this information to be detailed information that could be reviewed by the staff after a final approval by the Commission. He stated that the staff recommendation suggested conditioning the approval on additional information demonstrating that the surviving historic resources at the site would be treated in accordance with historic preservation standards. He observed that this was simply a more precise way of stating that the staff should review details. He articulated it in this way to make it clear that the staff was not proposing to review details of the new construction. Mr. Farnham concluded that the staff considered the application deficient, but not incomplete. The additional information was not needed to complete the application.

Mr. McClure observed that the application was submitted to the Commission on the 9 October 2007 and was available to the public as of that date. He observed that the interested parties did not issues their letters claiming that the application was incomplete until the afternoon of 22 October 2007, the day before the Architectural Committee meeting. He asserted that the timing revealed that the claim of incompleteness is nothing more than a litigation tactic; it is not a substantive objection. Mr. McClure stated that he provided the application materials to Mr. Boni as a courtesy. He noted that nothing in the Commission's ordinance or Rules & Regulations requires an applicant to provide copies of application materials to third parties. He claimed that the objections are related to the appeal of the Commission's in-concept approval and are nothing more than a red herring.

Attorney Richard DeMarco, who is representing the neighbors in the Lippincott Building, addressed the Committee. He stated that he received the additional materials, but that they did not change the circumstances. He stated that the original submission should be considered incomplete. He cited Section 6.2.f of the Rules & Regulations and noted that no site plan was included; he stated that the ground-floor plan, which shows the entire site, is not adequate. He protested the lack of true site plan and objected to the submission of the additional information.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the additional information was not available at the Commission's office when he reviewed the file on Friday, 19 October 2007.

Mr. McClure responded that the Commission's Rules & Regulations state that a complete application must be submitted nine days before the Committee's hearing. He claimed that it was and noted that the staff accepted his submission as complete. He stated that he merely augmented the application after the fact, which is allowed. Responding to Mr. DeMarco's

assertion about the lack of site plan, he stated that a site plan was submitted with the earlier application, which was incorporated into this application.

Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association asserted that public participation is valuable to the process; he should have been given the time to review all of the application materials. He stated that government must operate transparently.

Mr. Rivera stated that he considered the application incomplete. Ms. Voith stated that it was incomplete and deficient. Robert Thomas stated that this project is very important and should be reviewed thoroughly. He opined that construction documents should be provided for review. He stated that the application is missing key information. Mr. Yonce, the architect, stated that he had the 50% design development drawings, which are construction drawings, with him. He unrolled them and laid them out on the table. He stated that he did not consider these very detailed drawings appropriate for a Commission review. Mr. Levy stated that the review of the details for this important project should not be delegated to the staff. He stated that the ground-floor plan provides an adequate site plan. He noted that he has questions about how the new building would attach to the Lippincott Building. Ms. Voith stated that she would like to see a real demolition plan. Robert Thomas stated that the application as submitted would not be adequate for the issuance of a building permit by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Mr. Farnham remarked that the Commission itself never reviews full construction drawings, but always delegates that task to its staff, which verifies that the construction drawings reflect the approved drawings. For a large project such as this one, the construction drawings stamped approved by the staff are much more detailed than even the most detailed drawings ever reviewed by the Commission. The Commission typically reviews elevations, plans, and a few key details. Construction drawings document every structural, plumbing, electrical, and other detail, most of which are irrelevant to the Commission's review. Mr. Farnham asserted that any request that an applicant submit full construction drawings for review by the Committee and Commission is unrealistic. The Committee members stated that they considered the application to be lacking some key information. Mr. McClure again contended that the application was complete when evaluated according to the submission requirements listed in the Rules & Regulations. He claimed that the opposition had diverted the debate to the question of completeness. He claimed that the application was being held to a higher standard than the average application.

Mr. Sklaroff asked the Committee to define precisely the deficiencies in the application. He stated that the architect would provide the requisite drawings within two days if the Architectural Committee scheduled a special meeting to review the supplemented application before the Commission meeting on 9 November 2007. The Committee members agreed that a subset of the 50% design development drawings along with the materials already submitted would complete the application.

Mr. Silver objected to a special meeting. He noted that the approval in concept was granted more than one year ago. He claimed that there was no urgency. He requested that the Committee reject the application as incomplete. The applicants could submit a complete application for the next round of regular review meetings. He asserted that the public must have an opportunity to review and comment on the entirety of the application. Mr. McClure responded, asking why the opponents would object to an entire meeting devoted to this one application. A special meeting would allow for a complete review with full public comment. The Committee members stated that they would agree to a public meeting as long as sufficient public notice was provided. Mr. Farnham stated that Section 6.3.d.2 requires that an applicant submit materials nine working days before any Architectural Committee meeting. He stated that,

provided the supplementary materials were submitted tomorrow, the Committee could meet on November 6, 7, or 8 and provide a recommendation for the next Commission meeting on November 9. The Committee members agreed to meet during the morning of Wednesday, 7 November 2007.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee deferred the formulation of a recommendation until the special Architectural Committee meeting, which they tentatively scheduled for the morning of 7 November 2007.

48 AND 50 S. FRONT STREET, 103 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Centra Associates, Cheswall LP, Harvey and Robert Spears

Applicant: Richard C. DeMarco, Esq.

History: vacant lot; the three buildings on the site demolished 2007 under court order; individually designated and Contributing to Old City Historic District

Project: Parking lot

OVERVIEW: This application proposes paving the area where the recently demolished historic buildings stood and installing a landscaped perimeter. Drawings have been submitted to illustrate the planter and a brick and metal perimeter fence.

An open parking lot is not compatible with the massing, scale, rhythms, or materials of the historic district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. McCoubrey joined the Committee. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Property owners Robert and Harvey Spears, architect Eric Leighton, and attorney Richard DeMarco represented the application.

Mr. DeMarco noted that the current application is a supplemented version of the application reviewed by the Committee last month. The Commission continued the review to allow for the Committee to review the supplementary materials. He stated that the revised application responds to the suggestions offered by the Committee at the earlier review. Mr. DeMarco reviewed the property's history. He stated that the Commission denied a demolition application and rejected a hardship application for the three buildings that stood on the property. On appeal of these decisions, the Court of Commons Pleas ordered the City to issue the permits to demolish the buildings. He noted the consent decree defining the compromise between his clients and the Historical Commission. Mr. DeMarco stated that his clients had agreed not to request the rescissions of the designations after the demolitions. They plan to develop the site; the parking lot would be an interim use only. They will submit plans for the new development to the Commission for its review. He also noted that they will appear before the Zoning Board for their future development project, giving the community an opportunity to comment. Mr. DeMarco cautioned the Architectural Committee that it should not base its recommendation on the proposed parking use; he asserted that use falls outside its purview. He acknowledged the Committee has authority over architectural and preservation matters and welcomed its comments. Mr. Thomas agreed that use is not within the Committee's purview, but he did assert that the Committee could base a recommendation on the size, scale, rhythm, massing, and design of the parking lot. He stated that the Committee should be guided by the Secretary of Interior Standards. He opined that this proposal does not meet the Standards.

Joseph Schiavo of the Old City Civic Association noted that the proposed parking lot would be an extension of an existing parking lot, which does not meet current parking lot requirements. He asserted that the improvements like landscaping should be extended to the entire parking lot, not only the new areas. Mr. DeMarco contended that this is a zoning issue. He stated that the historically designated area would be landscaped. Ms. Voith asked for clarification on the boundaries of the site. She asked if the old and new parking lots would be combined into one large parcel. She asked if the Commission would now have full jurisdiction over the entire site, even the portion considered non-contributing. She asked why the applicants had given the Committee a site plan for the entire lot. Mr. DeMarco replied that he needs the approval of the Historical Commission on the entire project before he can present the plans to the Zoning Board.

In response to Ms. Voith's question, Mr. Baron explained that the historic buildings were demolished without the approval of the Historical Commission. The consent decree that did provide for their demolition acknowledges the Commission's plenary jurisdiction over the site, which was developed, not a vacant lot, when the historic district was created. Even if the individual designations were rescinded, the Commission would retain plenary jurisdiction. With or without a consent decree, the Commission retains full jurisdiction. Mr. Thomas suggested that the applicants should improve the pedestrian experience around the entire parking lot. He noted that, with the loss of the three historic buildings, there is a very large gap in the historic fabric at this corner. Ms. Voith again stated that the entire site, not just the addition to the lot, should be improved. Mr. Thomas agreed and asked the applicants to mitigate the loss of historic fabric on the corner. Ms. Voith stated that she would like to see a more fully developed proposal. Mr. Thomas suggested signage interpreting the historic site. The Committee members agreed that the proposed parking lot did not satisfy Standard 9. They suggested that the applicants look at well-designed parking lots in the city, for example in Chestnut Hill.

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

1300 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: Hartford Omega, LLC

Applicant: John Dundon, architect

History: c. 1830

Project: restoration, rooftop addition, rear gate

OVERVIEW: This project involves two c. 1830 houses that have been internally combined into one structure and used for many years as a language school. The corner building at some point lost its grand marble stair. Since designation, the building was fitted with aluminum windows and panning without a permit. The proposal calls for rehabilitating the structure to be used as condominium units with a ground-floor restaurant. The restoration aspect of the design calls for removing the aluminum windows and panning and installing correct wood windows. The blocked up opening in the center of the façade would be reopened and fitted with a restored door and new solid block marble stairs.

To accommodate the new restaurant, the applicant proposes to cut down a window on 13th Street and create a door with an internal ramp to reach the level of the first floor. A large window is proposed for the first floor at 13th Street to provide a view for diners. On the rear, the plans call for a garage door to be installed on Cypress Street to cover the loading dock for the restaurant.

The residential space in the building would be increased in size with a glazed addition on top of the roof of the visible rear ell.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the restoration, side door for ADA, and the rear garage door, with the staff to review details, but denial of the rooftop addition and the new window on the side façade, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz and Mr. D'Alessandro joined the Committee. Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jack Dundon represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the addition would be visible from 13th Street. He noted that the rear roof was altered before designation; a dormer was removed and a stair tower erected in its place.

Mr. Dundon stated that his plans for the garage door needed to be modified to omit the roof to avoid creating a zoning issue. He is now proposing a swing-type door at the rear, which would not need a roof and therefore not create zoning difficulties. He stated that it would appear like the proposed door, but would not roll up. He stated that the rear space would be used as a loading dock for the restaurant. Mr. Dundon explained that he needs to add a pedestrian door at the rear gate for egress.

Mr. Baron stated that the restoration work did not present impediments to approval. However, other work may. He noted that a window on 13th Street would be cut down to a door. It is needed for ADA. He noted that the staff objected to the cutting of a new window on 13th Street and the construction of the rooftop addition. Mr. Dundon stated that the addition of a unit on the roof would pay for the restoration. Ms. Voith stated that she was confused by the drawings. She could not understand the addition on the roof. Ms. Voith stated that she was opposed to the rooftop addition and new window. The Committee agreed that cutting the window for the door for ADA was acceptable but that the new window and the addition were not appropriate. Mr. Dundon stated that he needed at least some limited rooftop addition for egress, even if not for additional residential space. Ms. Voith stated that there may be an acceptable addition for egress, but the plans would need to be submitted for review. Mr. Dundon stated that he accepted the recommendation of denial for the new window at the corner, but he was more concerned about a recommendation of denial for the addition. Mr. Thomas responded that the addition does not meet the Standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the restoration, side door for ADA, and the rear garage door, with the staff to review details, but denial of the rooftop addition and the new window on the side façade, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

401 S. 17TH STREET, AKA 1644 PINE STREET

Owner: Property Locators Inc.

Applicant: David Schwartz, contractor

History: c.1840, contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District

Project: rebuild west wall with new brick, restore facades

OVERVIEW: This property formerly housed a store at the ground floor and a residence above. The building, which was hit by a car a number of years ago, has a bow in the west wall. The

storefront door in that wall had been previously closed up as part of the wall repair. The proposal calls for rebuilding the west wall with new brick. The plans show the restoration of all other aspects of the two facades. The window details however are not appropriate to the building.

The staff has visited the site to look at the condition of the existing brick in the west wall and the proposal for a new brick. The staff has determined that the new brick is not a good match and recommends the salvage of the brick from the existing wall to be used in the reconstruction of the west wall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the façade restoration, with the staff to review details; denial of the use of the new brick for the reconstruction of the west façade, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer Ofer Joe Noga represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that he had spoken with the architect by telephone earlier that day. The architect reported that his engineer has determined that the west wall could be repaired with star bolts, obviating its reconstruction. However, he noted that the bow in the wall could not be pulled back to a plumb position; the developer is concerned that it should not only be secure, but should look secure as well. Mr. Baron stated that he examined the building. The brick on the west wall has paint on it. Openings in the wall have been infilled to help stabilize the wall. That infill does not match the original brick. However, the infill brick would be removed as part of the restoration. He noted that there is some mismatched brick at the corner that would not be removed. It could be replaced with appropriate salvaged brick. Mr. Baron noted that the developer wants to build with new brick for a consistent look on the west wall.

Ms. Pentz asked if all three doors are historic. Mr. Baron stated that they are historic and are typical of Greek Revival storefronts. Ms. Pentz asked about the thickness of the west wall. Mr. Baron stated that he was not certain, but thought that it was eight inches thick.

Mr. Noga stated that he would agree to all of the restoration, which would cost more than \$100,000, provided the west wall looks good when it is complete. He stated that the old brick in the wall is in very poor condition and is "chipping away."

Mr. Levy noted that the two buildings to the south are similar to this building. Mr. Baron agreed and stated that they were constructed together with this building as a row. Mr. Levy noted that one of the facades has been rebuilt. He thought that it would not be possible to reuse the brick or find salvaged brick that would match the historic brick. He suggested using the new brick that the neighbor had used. Mr. Noga stated that the proposed brick is slightly taller than the existing brick. The difference would only be two courses over the entire façade. He said that the façade now includes ten different kinds of brick. He added that he would build the wall to match exactly the historic wall, except with new brick.

Mses. Pentz and Voith and Mr. McCoubrey advocated for retaining and reusing the historic brick. Messrs. Rivera, Levy, and D'Alessandro advocated for rebuilding with new brick.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the façade restoration, with the staff to review details. The Committee

did not reach a consensus on the use of new brick; three voted to recommend approval; three voted to recommend denial of the use of new brick.

400 S. 40TH STREET

Owner: University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Andrew Curtis

History: c. 1856; significantly altered and added to c. 1990, 1964, and 1975
individually designated, 11/1/1973

Project: In concept: Restore mansion, construct 10-story building with link

OVERVIEW: This application, in concept, proposes to largely restore this c. 1856 Italianate house and construct a ten-story building that will link to the historic mansion. The project will redevelop the site into an extended-stay hotel.

The house is currently encapsulated within mid-century additions. The applicant proposes to demolish these additions and restore or reconstruct the historic elements of the mansion. The appearance of the mansion is known from period photographs. The restoration details are not finalized, but the applicant has committed to restoring the house with the aid of the staff. The house would include the reception area, offices, the breakfast room, and several guest rooms.

The majority of the guest rooms as well as some retail space would be located in a tall new building to be constructed at the southern edge of the property. The new building would link to the old with a narrow connector. As originally submitted, the application proposed a 10-story building with retail on the ground floor, hotels rooms above, and a pool at the top floor. At the suggestion of the Architectural Committee and some members of the public, the design has been slightly revised. The application now proposes an 11-story building set back with three-story wings at the front and rear. The three-story wings are intended to provide transitions to the smaller buildings along 40th and Pine. Also, at the request of the Committee and public, the facades of the hotel building had been regularized. Originally, the windows were set rather randomly; they are now set in patterns, making the building more rhythmic and orderly.

The applicant also proposes some site improvements; these include the creation of a paved outdoor dining space to the east and the modification of a surface parking lot to the west. The site will be enhanced with a perimeter planter; the historic iron and granite fence does not exist.

Many have objected to the massing and size of the hotel building because of the impact it would have on the surroundings. The property at 400 S. 40th Street was designated individually. It is not located within a local historic district. A Spruce Hill Historic District has been proposed, but has not been created. Several individually designated properties stand in the vicinity, directly to the west and at greater distances to the southwest and northwest. The properties immediately adjacent to the north, south and east of 400 S. 40th Street including the twins along Baltimore Avenue are not individually designated to the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept, provided the historic mansion is restored, pursuant to §14-2007(7)(k)(.1), (.2), (.3), (.4), (.5), and (.6). Section 14-2007(7)(k) of the historic preservation ordinance directs the Commission to consider several factors when making its determination as to the appropriateness of proposed construction. In §14-2007(7)(k)(.1), the Commission is charged with considering the purposes of the historic preservation ordinance when making decisions. In §14-2007(1)(b), the “purposes” paragraph in the ordinance, the Commission is enjoined to:

- (.1) preserve buildings, structures, sites and objects which are important to the education, culture, traditions and economic values of the City;
- (.3) encourage the restoration and rehabilitation of buildings, structures, sites and objects which are designated as historic or which are located within and contribute to the character of districts designated as historic without displacing elderly, long-term, and other residents living within those districts;
- (.5) strengthen the economy of the City by enhancing the City's attractiveness to tourists and by stabilizing and improving property values; and
- (.6) foster civic pride in the architectural, historical, cultural and educational accomplishments of Philadelphia.

This project will preserve an historic building (.1); encourage the restoration and rehabilitation of a building without displacing elderly, long-term, and other residents (.3); strengthen the economy of the City by enhancing its attractiveness to tourists (.5); and foster civic pride in the accomplishments of Philadelphia. In §14-2007(7)(k)(.2), the Commission is charged with considering the historical, architectural or aesthetic significance of the building. This Italianate building has great architectural and aesthetic significance and should be restored. In §14-2007(7)(k)(.3), the Commission is charged with considering the effect of the proposed work on the building and its appurtenances. This project would have a profound and positive impact on the designated resource, the Italianate building, which is in desperate need of rehabilitation. In §14-2007(7)(k)(.4), the Commission is charged with considering the compatibility of the proposed work with the character of its site, including the effect of the proposed work on the neighboring structures, the surroundings and the streetscape. The impact in this regard is mixed. The restoration of the house with its quasi-public space and retail amenities would have a positive impact on its surroundings; it is currently vacant and dilapidated. The construction of the tower would have a negative impact on the surroundings owing to its size. However, only a small percentage of the adjoining properties are designated as historic and within the Commission's purview; this project is not located within an historic district. In §14-2007(7)(k)(.5), the Commission is charged with considering the design of the proposed work. Although commentators may differ in their stylistic preferences, all must admit that the design of the hotel is of a very high quality. In §14-2007(7)(k)(.6), the Commission is authorized to be guided by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. This project satisfies all relevant Standards; those are Standards 4, 5, 6, 9, and 10. As stipulated by Standard 4, the later changes to the property which have acquired historic significance, such as the later Colonial Revival features, will be retained and preserved. As stipulated by Standard 5, distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved. As stipulated by 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, such as the missing front porch, will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence, especially historic photographs. As stipulated by Standard 9, 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, scale, and proportion to protect the integrity of the property and its environment. Where the scale and massing are compatible is arguable. As stipulated by Standard 10, new 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.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. She distributed sets of letters from the public for and against the proposed development. Attorney Anthony

Forte, architect Sam Olshin, developer Tom Lussenhop, and David Hollenberg, Paul Sehnert, and Esaul Sanchez of the University of Pennsylvania represented the application.

Mr. Forte presented an overview of the proposal. He noted that it is owned by the University of Pennsylvania. He stated that the developer sought to have it rescinded from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, but that the Commission denied the rescission proposal. The developer is now seeking to adaptively reuse the historic building. He noted that the Commission implied that it would approve the removal of the 1960s additions to allow for the restoration and reuse of the building. The developer plans to restore the building including the missing front porch. It will be converted for use as an extended stay hotel. A tall hotel building will be constructed at the edge of the site, what Mr. Forte called the rear, with a link to the historic building. The link will be minimal.

Ms. Voith asked Mr. Forte to clarify what he considered to be the front and rear of the historic building. Ms. Voith stated that she considered the 40th Street façade to be the front façade. Therefore, the hotel building would be at the side, not the rear. Mr. Forte stated that the main entrance to the Italianate house is currently on Pine Street. He therefore considers the Pine Street façade to be the front façade. Ms. Voith objected to this categorization.

Mr. Olshin, the architect, discussed the condition of the Italianate building. He stated that it is dilapidated and the cupola is failing. He stated that it nonetheless has important architectural character and, when restored, would make an excellent gateway to the hotel building. He displayed several historic photographs of the house, which had recently obtained from the Thoroughgood family, the former owner of the convalescent home on the site. He stated that he would recreate the Colonial Revival front porch, which is known from photographs. He stated that the grand interior stair is intact and would be preserved as the primary interior feature. He stated that he would also remove all of the non-historic additions and recreate missing historic bays and other exterior features during the complete restoration of the Italianate house. He displayed a site plan and noted that, with the removal of the non-historic additions, he would create a semi-public outdoor space to be used by the restaurant or café that would occupy the first floor of the new hotel building. He stated that he would provide a few parking spaces on the site at the rear, but would take advantage of a University parking garage and a valet service to keep most of the vehicles off the site. He noted that he would add a drop-off area along Pine Street. He asserted that the hotel building was not generic, but was a site specific building. It is meant to serve as a backdrop to the historic building; it does not compete with the historic building. Its features align with key features on the historic building. He showed sun and shadow studies and noted that, for the most part, the hotel building would cast shadows on the property in question only. He stated that they would landscape the site. He presented letters of support from near neighbors. Mr. Olshin displayed photographs of tall buildings in the area including early twentieth-century apartment buildings and university buildings. He stated that there at least 10 10-story buildings nearby. He also provided a sample of the terra cotta he is proposing for the façade of the hotel building. He opined that this proposal will bring new life to the historic building and preserve it for the long term. He contended that this proposal would reinvigorate the corner of 40th and Pine Streets.

Mr. Forte submitted letters of support from the majority of near neighbors.

Mr. Hollenberg reported that the University fully supports this project. The extended-stay hotel would be a quiet use because it would generate a relatively small amount of traffic. The proposed hotel building is also architecturally quiet. He opined that this development is very appropriate for the 40th Street commercial corridor.

Mr. Levy stated that the new building would be too tall for the area. He suggested six stories instead of 10. Mr. Lussenhop explained that he is working with the Hilton Hotel company. This hotel would be a franchise. He stated that Hilton and all hotel chains have very strict requirements for their hotels. He stated that the chains require 110 to 115 rooms, each 475 sf, for extended-stay hotels.

Ms. Voith again stated that she was confused about which façade of the historic building was considered the front facade. Mr. Hollenberg stated that the primary entrance has been and would be on Pine Street. Ms. Voith disagreed that the historic entrance would have been on Pine. Mr. Levy observed that, if the hotel were constructed as proposed, the 10-story building would rise up behind the three-story twin houses along Baltimore Avenue. Mr. McCoubrey stated that three and four-story residential buildings stand to the south and west of the site. The area to the north is a commercial area. Mr. Olshin replied that 40th Street from Market Street south to Baltimore Avenue is commercial. Ms. Voith opined that, given the materials submitted, it is difficult to evaluate the effect of the new construction on the neighborhood. She concurred with the staff's overview that the new construction does refer and defer to the historic building. She again stated that she was confused about which façade was the front façade. Mr. Hollenberg stated that a guest arriving at the house would have entered from Pine. Mr. Forte stated that the property must be developed in this way to offset the cost of the restoration of the historic house. Ms. Voith remarked that she appreciates the restoration. Mr. Rivera commented that the demolition of the non-historic buildings would create open space; however, the cost of the open space was the construction of the tower. Messrs. Rivera, D'Alessandro, and Levy asked if the hotel could be configured as a short-stay hotel to reduce its size. Mr. Olshin stated that a short-stay hotel would have a much greater impact on the neighborhood; he also noted that the University needs an extended-stay hotel. He noted that the building could not be reconfigured easily; it is designed to be very efficient. Mr. Lussenhop replied that there are no other extended stay hotels in the area; also, a short-stay hotel would not be able to compete owing to the restrictions of this site. He stated that this proposal would make this dilapidated building viable; the University has studied this question extensively and has not been able to find another feasible use. Mr. Hollenberg added that the University viewed the extended stay as a quiet use. Ms. Pentz asked if the building was individually designated. Mr. Forte replied that it was. Ms. Pentz asked if it was in an historic district. Mr. Forte stated that it was not. The Committee members discussed whether the Commission should review the project based on its impact on surroundings that are not designated, but did not reach a conclusion.

Karen Allen, a University City resident and member of the University City Historical Society, opined that the 10-story building is out of character with the neighborhood and would stand out like a "sore thumb." She stated that the 40th and Pine Street area is not a commercial area. She said that the neighborhood transitions from commercial to residential at Spruce Street. She thinks that a campus building should be built on the campus, not in the residential area. She claimed that the examples of tall buildings shown by Mr. Olshin are not close to this site. She concluded that approving the construction of this tower would open the door to other tall buildings in the area.

Chris O'Donnell stated that he owns a historic house one block away from the site. He stated that he does not believe that the hotel will provide valet parking in one of the University's parking garages. He speculated that the guests would park on the street. He opined that a 10-story building would be much too large for the neighborhood. He stated that the hotel building would cast shadows, especially in the winter when the sunlight was most important. He asserted that Mr. Olshin's terra cotta sample looked nothing like the brick or terra cotta in the

neighborhood. Mr. Olshin stated that the sample provided an example of the material only, but was not the color he planned to use. Mr. O'Donnell rejected the proposal and suggested that the Post Office site at 30th and Market Streets would be a great place for a 10-story building. He noted the Italianate mansions that line the south side of the 4000-block of Pine and concluded that the Commission should not strive to satisfy the Hilton Hotel chain.

Glen Moyer stated that he resides on the 4300-block. He is opposed to the development. He is concerned about traffic and noise. He objected to the letters of support submitted by Mr. Forte, claiming they did not represent the views of the residents.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance presented a packet of material to the Committee. He observed that the staff's recommendation did not reference the Secretary of Interior's Standards. He noted that the Commission's Rules & Regulations state that the staff "shall be guided by the Standards." He suggested that the proposal does not meet the Standards. He stated that the proposed tower is not compatible in size, scale, character, and materials with the area. He displayed a photograph taken to the north from the south side of Baltimore Avenue at the trolley terminal. On the photograph, he had drawn an approximate view of the proposed tower. He conceded that he was uncertain whether it was accurately scaled. He asserted that the proposed building was not compatible in size with the twins on Baltimore Avenue. He further stated that the proposed building is not in scale with the neighborhood. He presented his drawing of the proposed building overlaid on a photograph looking west from 40th Street. He then claimed that the proposed building is not compatible in character. He objected to the randomness of the windows. He asserted that it is not in character with the neighborhood. He stated that the nearby buildings are very rich in character. He stated that it is not compatible in materials as well. He cited apartment buildings in Garden Court as good examples of compatible construction. He said that they are compatible in scale, character, and materials. He warned that the architect may delude himself into thinking that the Committee approves of all aspects of the design if it recommends approval based solely on massing.

Meloni Lamond stated that she is a preservationists and a former president of the University City Historical Society. She stated that the community is very lucky that this building is designated. If it was not, there would be no opportunity for this discussion. She stated that this fact should cause neighbors to rethink their opposition to the proposed historic district. She stated that she supported this project. She noted that the rears of the properties on Baltimore Avenue, which back up to this site, are not used. She added that 40th Street does not have a residential character; it is a commercial street.

Ms. Pentz observed that the site is not within a historic district. She suggested that there are better forums to discuss neighborhood issues like height, traffic, and parking, for example the Zoning Board of Adjustment. She stated that this Committee must focus on preservation issues, not zoning issues. She stated that this property is individually designated; the Commission is charged with protecting building, not the surroundings, which are not designated as a district. She stated that the proposal will directly and positively impact the historic structure, which would be restored. She stated that she supports the proposal. Mr. McCoubrey praised the design and presentation, but stated that the proposed building is too large; he opposes the project because of the massing of the hotel building. He also suggested that the upper section of the hotel building should be set back from 40th Street. Messrs. D'Alessandro and Levy concurred. Mr. Levy praised the restoration. Ms. Voith objected to the massing of the proposed building, but stated that she may, in fact, prefer a taller building with a smaller footprint. She stated that the building should be pulled back from the 40th Street sidewalk. She concluded that she is not opposed to the overall plan, but is opposed to this particular design. She suggested that the

architect rethink his proposal. She added that she is still confused about which façade is the front façade. She suggested that Mr. Hollenberg may be incorrect. She agreed with Ms. Pentz that the Committee should not evaluate the project based on the impact to the surrounding properties that are not designated, but suggested that the applicants provide more information on the neighborhood in their next submission. Mr. Rivera stated that he is in support of the proposal, but thinks that it deserves additional study. The Committee members suggested pulling the tall building away from 40th Street and also redesigning the hotel building to better relate to the historic buildings on Pine Street to the west of the site.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted 4 to 2 to recommend denial.

2503 S. 21ST STREET

Owner: Joseph & Terri Pooler

Applicant: Anthony Miskitz

History: c. 1910

Project: In concept: Construct rear addition, exterior alterations

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear addition and reconstruct a rear yard fence. The rear of the property is visible from Porter Street. The rear of the property currently has a one-story addition. The proposed expansion would retain this addition and build a second-floor on it. The construction would require the demolition of a non-historic chimney and side steps, and the infill of two windows. The addition would be finished in brick to match the existing and would replicate the soldier course and quoins found in the original portion of the building. The rear yard is encircled by its original hairpin iron fence. The applicant proposes to replace the historic fence with a new design that would incorporate the hairpin design within a three-foot brick wall and six-foot piers. This design would double the height of the fence from three to six.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the second-story addition, pursuant to Standard 9 and denial of the fence as proposed, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9

DISCUSSION: Ms. Voith excused herself from the meeting. Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Joseph Pooler and Anthony Miskitz represented the application.

The Committee members agreed that the proposed addition would be appropriate. Mr. Rivera stated that the historic fences are character defining features of the Girard Estate Historic District. Mr. Miskitz asked for some examples of fences that would be compatible with the district, but would provide the privacy he is seeking in his rear yard. Mr. Baron suggested that plantings would help create the desired privacy.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the second-story addition, pursuant to Standard 9; denial of the fence, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

739 WALNUT STREET

Owner: Steven Singer

Applicant: Thomas Wiedenman

History: c. 1928; contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Replace windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install aluminum-clad windows with swinging casements at the sides and fixed windows at the center and transoms in all the historic window openings in the south and west façades. The original windows were tripartite windows and transoms that were set-in slightly from the façade. This application also proposes a new storefront door on the first floor where the fire escape used to be at the rear on the 8th Street façade and fixed glass non-divided windows at the second and third floor of the former fire escape.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the two fixed windows and door at the former fire escape, recessed from the façade, and denial of the remaining proposal pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Steven Singer and Thomas Wiedenman represented the application.

Mr. Baron pointed out that a photograph from 1931 shows the historic window configuration. Mr. Singer stated that he is attempting to replicate the historic windows, but with fewer divisions. He would like a single-light, rather than a multi-light, transom. He noted that he will retain the existing non-historic windows if he does not receive the approval he is seeking. Ms. Pentz stated that the new windows should include the historically-appropriate tripartite transom. The Committee members agreed that the alterations to the fire stair were acceptable.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the transoms have the historic pane and mullion configuration, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6.

2100 FAIRMOUNT AVENUE

Owner: Spaventre Enterprises

Applicant: A. C. Roberson

History: c. 1922; individually designated, 12/06/1979; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize exterior alterations

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of a basement stair with a metal railing and entrance in the sidewalk at the front façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. Levy questioned if these stairs were for accessibility or fire-code purposes. The staff was unable to answer the question.

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

343 S. 5TH STREET

Owner: Keith and Tara Lamont

Applicant: Keith Lamont
History: c. 1970, Stephen Mark Goldner, architect
contributing to Society Hill Historic District, 12/12/2003
Project: Install new windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install new windows at the front and the visible rear of this building. These windows are intended to match the existing, excepting awning windows are proposed in place of the small sliders at the rear. Also a bronze color is proposed to match the neighbor's windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6 and owing incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. No one represented the application.

The Committee members concluded that they could not definitively determine whether the proposed windows were appropriate owing to the incomplete application materials. They did note that the color and configuration of the proposed window system did not match the original windows.

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

2018 BRANDYWINE STREET

Owner: Kevin T. Ryan
Applicant: Chris Plunkett
History: c. 1859; individually designated, 05/01/1975; contributing to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000
Project: Construct rear roof deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes repairs and the installation of new stairs to an existing roof deck. It also proposes to construct a small bump-out addition and cut an a new opening for a window at the third-floor rear, as well as the infill of a window, a new window opening and new vinyl windows at the first-floor rear. This work would not be visible from any public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the rear alterations, but denial of the roof deck owing to the Commission's policy on roof decks on main blocks.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Kevin Ryan and Barry Specter represented the application.

Mr. Ryan described his proposal to the Committee. Ms. Cote explained to the Committee that the deck, which is located on the main block, may have been built illegally; the staff is waiting for information from the Department of Licenses & Inspections to determine the legality of the deck. Mr. Ryan stated that the deck was in place when he purchased the property. He would like to retain it.

Ms. Pentz asked if any of the proposed work including the deck would be visible from a public right-of-way. Ms. Cote responded that neither the deck nor the proposed alterations are or would be visible from the public right-of-way.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the rear alterations and the repair of the existing roof deck.

2119 DELANCEY PLACE

Owner: Harriet Berneman

Applicant: David Matus

History: c. 1865; alterations by Deeberger and Rabenold, 1923; individually designated 01/06/1972; Contributing to the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 02/08/1995

Project: Install simulated-divided-light windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove existing one-over-one vinyl windows and install four-over-four simulated-divided-light windows in all openings including the dormers on the front façade. The proposed muntins would not replicate the historic muntins. The new curved muntin profile would differ greatly from the historic, squared profile with putty slopes. The dormer windows would not have been four-over-four historically. The windows originally had two-over-two, double-hung sash.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Messrs. Rivera and Levy excused themselves from the Committee meeting. Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Window salesman David Matus represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that the original windows had a wide vertical muntin and a narrow horizontal muntin. He stated that the proposed muntin profile was incorrect; it should have a putty slope. He noted that the dormer windows should be two-over-two sash.

Mr. Matus stated that he could install two-over-two, double-hung windows in the dormers. He could also add a putty slope to the muntins. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Levy recommended that Mr. Matus or the staff verify the dimensions of the proposed windows by examining windows on neighboring buildings.

The Committee concluded that the windows should be entirely true-divided-light to be consistent with the Standards and precedent. Mr. Matus claimed that Kolbe & Kolbe would not manufacture true-divided-light windows with insulated glass with the mixing of the two different muntin sizes. They could make the larger muntin true divided light and the narrow muntin as an applied grill. He also claimed that the Committee had recommended approval of similar simulated-divided-light windows in the past. The Committee members stated that they were not aware of any such approval. Mr. Matus stated that the Committee and Commission are not fair or consistent. He contended that the Commission unfairly limits window choices to two manufacturers. Ms. Pentz countered that the Commission limits window choices to manufacturers who can replicate the historic windows. Mr. Matus stated that most historic preservation agencies including the New York Landmarks Commission allow simulated-divided-light windows. He stated the owner would leave the vinyl windows in place if his proposal is not approved.

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

18-22 LETITIA STREET

Owner: EFL Partners

Applicant: Rustin Ohler

History: 1855, individually designated, 10/7/1976; Contributing to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Construct fire escape on front facade

OVERVIEW: An application for the removal of an existing fire escape on the Letitia Street façade and reconstruction in kind was first proposed to the Historical Commission in January 2007. The original fire escape extended from the second to fifth story. The landings on the second and third stories spanned five bays. On the fourth and fifth stories, the landings spanned only three bays. The Commission approved the removal and reconstruction of a steel fire escape in the same configuration as the existing fire escape.

The applicant now returns with a revised application to reconstruct the fire escape. The fire escape now, however, is proposed to span five bays on the second through fifth stories, unlike the original configuration.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Brett Harmon, the architect, represented the application.

Mr. Harmon stated that the fire escape extension was necessary to provide egress for additional units on the upper levels of the building. He explained that the original fire escape is deteriorated and must be replaced. The Committee members noted that the fire escape would not only be enlarged, but that its structural members would also be enlarged. It would not look like an historic fire escape. Mr. Harmon stated that the replacement beams must be of larger dimensions to meet the current building code.

The Committee suggested that the applicant redesign the fire escape so that the new landing extensions on the fourth and fifth levels are recessed to match the design of the original second and third story landings.

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

2350 ST. ALBANS PLACE

Owner: Scott Donahue

Applicant: Scott Donahue

History: c. 1868; individually designated 9/30/1969

Project: Exterior alterations and demolish rear structure

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove all metal siding concealing a mansard roof, dormers, upper cornice, and lower cornice with dentils. There is evidence that many of the wood features are still intact; they will be restored and painted. The roof will be replaced with a rubber simulated slate roofing to match the original shingles in design, color, shape, and size.

Paint will be removed from all masonry lintels and sills.

Two-over-two windows are proposed for the second-story rear bay, however no shop drawings have been submitted for review. Ornamental wood details are proposed for the dormers; however no design profiles have been submitted for review.

This application also proposes the removal of an existing one-story rear masonry shed. The opening will be bricked over and a modern door and frame will be installed. No shop drawings have been submitted.

Baist's 1895 atlas indicates the rear of the building was flush with the rears of the whole row. The row houses on the 2300 block of St. Albans were originally built with one-story masonry structures on the rears. The surviving brick one-story rear extension is therefore original and should be preserved.

A wooden vertical slat fence is proposed to enclose the rear yard.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the demolition of the rear one-story masonry shed removal pursuant to Standards 2 and 6. There is insufficient evidence regarding the existing shingles to offer a recommendation. Approval of all other restoration, pursuant to Standards 6 and 7.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Scott Donahue and architect David Traub represented the application.

The Committee asked the applicants why they wanted to demolish the rear extension, which appears original. Mr. Donahue stated that three of the four corner houses on this block do not have their sheds and that keeping the shed would greatly reduce the size of his rear yard. Mr. Baron suggested the compromise of retaining only the exterior west wall and cornice as a yard wall. Mr. D'Alessandro stated the wall would need to be reinforced, but retaining it is a good compromise. Mr. Donahue opined that retaining the brick wall of the shed along the street would be unattractive. He rejected the suggestion.

The applicant submitted an email from Eric Kachele, a structural engineer, describing a crack and deterioration in the west wall of the rear shed. The owner asserted that the condition is unsafe and the shed should be removed.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that if the rear shed was minimally visible, the Committee could recommend approval of its demolition. However, the building is located on a highly visible corner of an important row house development and the west elevation is a significant façade. He agreed that the west wall of the rear shed should be retained and explained that the Committee was offering a compromise.

Ms. Sell asked the applicant if any of the slate roofing survived. Mr. Donahue stated that there is no evidence of any slate on the roof.

The Committee commended Mr. Donahue for his endeavor to restore this historic building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the demolition of the rear one-story masonry shed, pursuant to Standards 2 and 6; approval of all other restoration and roof replacement, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 7.

7406 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Owner: New Covenant Church of Philadelphia

Applicant: Van B. Strother

History: 1892, Wilson Brothers, Wissinoming Hall, Pennsylvania School for the Deaf
individually designated 05/28/1957, 05/07/1973

Project: Construct and elevator shaft and pergola

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a five-story exterior elevator tower, and alter a fire escape at the rear of this large building on the campus of the New Covenant Church. The Wilson Brothers, a prominent architectural and engineering firm, designed this and the other large stone buildings on the pastoral campus in the early 1890s, during the same period it designed the significant Reading Terminal train shed on the 1100-block of Market Street.

In August 2007, the Commission approved an elevator proposal in concept for this location including massing of the tower, shape of the roof, and location of the entrance.

The applicant now proposes the final approval of the exterior elevator tower approved in concept. The tower and entrance would be located between two rear wings on the south side of this E-shaped building. The construction of the elevator tower would require cutting through the eave of the roof and removing windows, a chimney, and a dormer. The tower would be faced with an ashlar stone veneer. An aluminum and glass link would connect the stone tower to the historic building. The tower would be topped with a gable roof, recalling the dormer. Wood shingles would be installed on the roof of the new elevator shaft.

Near the elevator tower, a window opening would be cut down for a door, however no shop drawings for the door have been submitted for review.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Commission's approval in concept.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Van Strother of New Covenant Church represented the application.

Mr. McCoubrey objected to the wood shingles at the top of the tower. He contended that the ashlar stone veneer should continue up the shaft of the tower. The asphalt shingles of the main roof should be used to roof the elevator addition as well.

Mr. Strother submitted a revised design for a trellis and landscaping at the entrance adjacent to the elevator shaft. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the trellis be held back from the main building and terminate before the last window. Mr. Strother agreed.

Mr. Strother submitted a sample of the ashlar stone veneer and literature about the product.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Commission's approval in concept.

45 N. 3RD STREET

Owner: Andrew Eisenstein

Applicant: Stuart Rosenberg, architect

History: c.1850, additions late nineteenth century

Project: construct storefront doors

OVERVIEW: The Commission has previously reviewed and approved plans for the restoration of the front façade. The applicant finds that the previously proposed double doors do not meet code. Each leaf would be too narrow. Now they propose either a symmetrical arrangement of single doors that appear as double doors with wide side panels or an asymmetrical arrangement of a wider door and a narrower door in each opening. The applicant prefers the latter.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Serena Rose and Greg Mastalerz represented the application.

Ms. Rose stated that the historic storefront openings are too narrow to allow for double-leaf doors that would meet the building code. She stated that the door must be at least three feet wide, but the opening will not allow two three-foot doors. Mr. Baron displayed the many iterations of the door design that he and Ms. Rose had contemplated. Ms. Rose stated that one six-foot door that looks like a double-leaf door would be infeasible. She noted that the building code allowed some classes of buildings to have 32-inch, rather than 36-inch, doors, but this building does not fit into any of those classes owing to its occupant load.

Richard Thom of the Old City Civic Association suggested some alternatives, but Ms. Rose and Mr. Baron noted that they had already tried and rejected those alternatives.

Mr. D'Alessandro pointed out that one could mimic the historic doors with the introduction of an astragal in Scheme 1A. Ms. Rose stated that that solution would be acceptable from her perspective. Mr. Baron agreed that it would provide the best approximation of the historic door and still satisfy the building code.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of Scheme 1A, provided it has an astragal.

4367 MAIN STREET

Owner: Elliot and Maxine Hoffman

Applicant: Bruce Cooper

History: c.1910, storefront c. 1950

Project: In concept: demolish and construct new storefront

OVERVIEW: This in concept proposal calls for combining this building with its neighbor to expand Jake's Restaurant. The applicant wishes to demolish the elaborate Moderne recessed storefront constructed of enameled metal panels. The new storefront would be flush with the street front and have operable cafe windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to PM-704.2.6:

Storefronts: Original existing storefronts contributing to the character of the district shall be retained and repaired. New storefronts shall be compatible with the proportion, form and materials of the original building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Business owner Bruce Cooper and architects Brian Tracy and Rebecca Pickens represented the application.

Messrs. Cooper and Tracy explained that they are proposing to expand Mr. Cooper's restaurant, which is located in the building to the east, into the space at 4367 Main Street. They stated that the extant storefront, which is not original, but which was added about 1950, is not compatible with the proposed restaurant use. They stated that the store is currently vacant. Mr. Tracy, the architect, stated that he has explored numerous schemes to incorporate the existing storefront into his restaurant design, but is unable to use it. The storefront is very deep and is divided into two long display areas along the outer walls and a narrow, central walkway. He stated that none of the existing spaces is compatible with the restaurant use; they are too narrow.

Mr. Tracy stated that he has examined the 1950s storefront very carefully. It is in poor condition; the glass and panels are failing. It is neither code compliant nor ADA compliant. Moreover, it is much shorter than the original storefront. He stated that the awkward signboard above the storefront hides the area where the original storefront transoms would have been located. He stated that the signboard makes the building look like its pants are pulled up too high. He contended that the proposed storefront would be more compatible with the historic building and more in character with the historic area. He also stated that he would restore the original storefront if he had information about it.

Mr. Cooper stated that he would not purchase the building if he was required to retain the 1950s storefront. Mr. Cooper stated that he would like to open an annex to his restaurant, Jake's, in this storefront, but cannot use the storefront as it is now configured. He stated that the recessed storefront occupies about 30% of the total space on the first floor of the building. He asserted that it is not financially feasible to purchase the building when 30% of the ground-floor space is occupied by an unusable storefront. Mr. Cooper reported that the storefront is vacant and is unlikely to find a tenant in this configuration. He asserted that Manayunk has declined in the last decade and high-quality restaurants like his offer Manayunk some hope for the future. He stated that Manayunk will not prosper without quality establishments.

Mr. Baron stated that this storefront is very unusual and should be preserved. He stated that it is one of the best examples of an Art Moderne recessed storefront in the city. Mr. Tracy countered that it is neither Art Deco nor Art Moderne, but dates to the 1950s. He agreed that it is unusual, but asserted that it is unrelated to the historic buildings in Manayunk.

Hillel Levinson addressed the Committee members on behalf of the Manayunk Development Corporation, of which he is the president. He advocated for the approval of this proposal. He stated that the space as currently configured is unusable. He stated that Manayunk needs this type of business to survive. He stated that the area has declined significantly recently with the introduction of numerous "drunk" bars. He asserted that this type of establishment would help Manayunk to recover. He agreed with Mr. McCoubrey's assessment that this storefront is not suitable for restaurant usage. Mr. Levinson said that it is likely to remain vacant if the storefront is retained. Mr. Tracy also agreed, stating that this retail space will remain vacant and continue to deteriorate if his client cannot reuse the building.

The Committee members stated that they are charged with protecting historic resources in Manayunk. They noted that the storefront is very unusual.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to PM-704.2.6.

419 S. 6TH STREET, MOTHER BETHEL A.M.E. CHURCH

Owner: Mother Bethel A.M.E. Church

Applicant: Shawn Evans, AIA

History: 1890, Hazlehurst & Huckel

Project: Install lightning protection system

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a lightning protection system. The system will consist of copper lightning rods installed at the highest points of the building. The church is ornamented with carved stone finials. The application proposes to install one rod to the side of each of the eight finials. This installation will require copper straps to be fastened at least in two points into the stone finials. The applicant proposes to fasten the straps directly into the stone not the mortar joints of the finials, owing to compliance requirements for the certification of the system. The rods will be connected to copper conductors that will transfer the electric charge down to the ground in case of a lightning strike. These conductors would be fastened into the masonry of the building. The building has a limestone front façade and brick side facades. As with the finials, the proposed installation is directly into the stone, not mortar joints.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff is concerned about the proposed attachments; however, it defers to the expertise of the Architectural Committee and seeks its guidance.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz excused herself, leaving the Committee without a quorum. Mr. Baron explained that the Committee lacked a quorum. He asked if anyone present objected to proceeding without a quorum. No one objected. He presented the application to the members of the Architectural Committee. Dolores Lyons of Mother Bethel Church, architect Shawn Evans, and Stephen Humeniuk of Warren Lightning Rod Company represented the application.

Messrs. Evans and Humeniuk summarized the need for lighting protection, the certification system for lighting protection systems, and the possible methods of installation. Mr. Evans stated that the National Park Service, Pennsylvania Museum & Historical Commission, and Partners for Sacred Places, which is funding the project, have all approved of it. Mr. Humeniuk stated that the material would be tin-coated copper. He displayed samples. Most importantly, Mr. Humeniuk explained that the lighting rods and cabling must be attached to masonry, not mortar joints, to receive the requisite certification. Messrs. McCoubrey and D'Alessandro objected to any use of hammer drills when creating mounting holes in the finials. They also objected to any expanding anchors. They feared that any sharp impacts or vibrations to the masonry finials might damage them. They requested that the installers gently drill into the finials for the mounting. They also requested that the installers manually insert the anchors and manually install the rods and cables. Mr. Humeniuk proposed to use lead mollies with stainless steel bolts. Mr. McCoubrey asked if he could use adhesive fasteners. Mr. Humeniuk stated that they considered that option, but dismissed it as unworkable because the adhesives are very large, the size of an index card. Mr. McCoubrey stated that they must not use any sort of concussive mounting system. Mr. Evans noted that the church is a National Historic Landmark,

the highest recognition the federal government gives. He stated that he would oversee the installation and also revise the design to allow for a staff-level approval.

NO-QUORUM RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the lighting rods are installed as gently as possible without hammer drills or mechanically-inserted anchors.

130 QUEEN STREET

Owner: Richard Donaghy and Karen Weldon

Applicant: Ivano D'Angella

History: c. 1810

Project: Legalize this-floor addition and exterior alterations

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize alterations done to this property by the previous owner. The current owner submitted an application on December 2005 requesting legalization of the changes and approval of new roof-decks, the Commission tabled the application for a period not to exceed six months. The application was scheduled to be heard by the Commission in June 2006; however, the applicant withdrew the application before the Commission review.

The illegal work involves modifications to the rear of the property, which is highly visible. The rear ell originally had a half gambrel roof. The gambrel was an especially unique and significant example of historic architecture. Few, if any, survive in the city. The previous owner demolished the gambrel and expanded the third story of the rear ell. The previous owner also added windows, French doors, and a balcony. The roofline of a small side shed addition at the rear was also raised. A photograph dated 3 May 2004 shows the work to the shed addition underway. The Commission has no record that any proposal for these rear alterations was ever reviewed or approved. Furthermore, the Department of Licenses & Inspections has no record that it issued a building permit for the rear alterations. The current owners purchased the building with these changes and seek to legalize them. The Commission was unaware of the illegal alterations until the current owner sought approval for a deck. The Commission did not request the issuance of violations for the illegal work until after the time of the sale.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron explained that the Committee lacked a quorum. He asked if anyone present objected to proceeding without a quorum. No one objected. He presented the application to the members of the Architectural Committee. Property owners Richard Donaghy and Karen Weldon and architect Ivano D'Angella represented the application.

Richard Donaghy and Karen Weldon explained that, after their last appearance before the Commission, they attempted to hold the previous owner, who had undertaken the illegal work, accountable. They explained that they filed a lawsuit, which was settled in their favor through arbitration. They noted, however, that the restitution they received did not even cover their legal expenses. They stated that they could not reconstruct the historic ell. Mr. D'Angella stated that his clients have received their zoning approval for the alterations. He also noted that the community group has approved the project.

Messrs. McCoubrey and D'Alessandro explained that they were charged with employing the Secretary of the Interior's Standards when reviewing the application. They stated that the illegal

work did not comply with the Standards. Mr. Farnham stated that the Committee is a technical, body. The Commission has the discretion to legalize the rear alterations. He suggested that the owners plead their case before the Commission.

NO-QUORUM RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Reconstruction Standard 4: Reconstruction will be based on an accurate duplication of historic features and elements substantiated by documentary or physical evidence rather than on conjectural designs or the availability of different features from other historic properties. A reconstructed property will re-create the appearance of the non-surviving historic property in materials, design, color, and texture.

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

Standard 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

Standard 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.