

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

**25 JULY 2006
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
VINCENT RIVERA, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA
Daniela Voith, AIA

Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician
Erin McGinn-Cote, Historic Preservation Planner

ALSO PRESENT

Robert Moy
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Edwin Rivera, Queen Village Neighbors Association
Suzanna Barucco, Kise Straw & Kolodner
James Straw, Kise Straw & Kolodner
Cathy Harris, Mural Arts Program
Amy Johnston, Mural Arts Program
Jane Golden, Mural Arts Program
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Paul Boni, Society Hill Civic Association
Jeffrey Brydzinski
Steven A. Weixler, Society Hill Civic Association
Carey Jackson Yonce, Venturi Scott Brown Associates
Craig Schelter, Schelter & Associates
Rebecca Vieyra, Venturi Scott Brown Associates
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Larry Silver, Esq., Langsam, Stevens & Silver
Ron Patterson, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers
Van Strother, New Covenant Church
Laura Siena, West Mount Airy Neighbors
Richard Thom, AIA
Leo Addimando, 806 Normandy Group
Debi Rochelle
Michael Caven
Wen Zheng
Paul Thompson, BluePath Design
Lanny Leibowitz, Architect
Joseph DiSanto

CALL TO ORDER

Architectural Committee members Robert Thomas, Daniela Voith, Suzanne Pentz, and Daniel McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

2428 POPLAR STREET

Owner/Applicant: Robert Moy

History: Date 1891, John T. Windrim for Girard Estate, Designated 1/5/1984

Project: Legalize revised roof deck

OVERVIEW: In May 2006, the Historical Commission reviewed and denied an application to legalize a roof deck constructed without a building permit or the Commission's approval. During that review, the Commission advised the applicant to seek ways to minimize the impact of the deck on the historic property. The applicant now proposes a revised deck, which was redesigned in accordance with the comments of the Architectural Committee and Commission.

The property is located at the corner of 24th and Poplar Streets. As constructed, the deck, which occupies the entire footprint of the rear ell, is highly visible from 24th Street. The current application proposes to set the deck three feet back from the 24th Street façade. This setback would diminish the visibility of the deck along this façade and would eliminate all visibility from the west side of 24th Street looking north. The current bracing and supports on the 24th street façade would be removed and new, less conspicuous structural members would be set back five feet from the façade. The supports would rest on a new beam that would be placed parallel to the mentioned façade. This setback would greatly diminish the perceived height and massing of the deck. The original application proposed to cut a door to the deck in the mansard. The application now proposes to convert the west dormer window into a door for access.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee, Robert Moy, the owner, represented the application.

Ms. Pentz inquired about the redesigned structural system. Mr. Moy provided an overview of the system, which would be less visible from the street. Ms. Pentz stated that the new structure appeared appropriate. Ms. Voith and Mr. Thomas opined that the redesigned deck complies with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the revised deck application, with the staff to review details.

916 S. SWANSON STREET, AKA 901-21 S. WATER STREET; 1-25 WASHINGTON AVENUE

Owner: Gloria Dei Episcopal Church

Applicant: David Artman

History: c. 1830s

Project: Construct addition to rectory

OVERVIEW: This application proposes an addition to the rectory of Gloria Dei Church. The rectory is a freestanding building; it is not connected to the church building. The rectory building, although not as old as Gloria Dei, dates from the mid nineteenth century. The proposed addition would be constructed along a solid party wall, with a set-back of twelve feet from the front façade of the rectory. It would be two stories high, three bays wide, and have a pitched roof. The building already has two small additions, one at the rear, one at the side; both additions are sided with wood clapboard. The proposed addition would be sided with fibro-cement board, fenestrated with clad windows, and roofed asphalt shingles.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Architects James Straw and Suzanna Barucco of Kise, Straw & Kolodner represented the application.

Mr. Straw explained that this application proposes new living quarters for the pastor. The addition will house a library for the pastor's collection of 5000 books and will serve as a music room for her husband. Mr. Straw explained that he sought to design an addition that would be as unobtrusive as possible. He displayed several photographs of the property.

Mr. Straw reported that the exterior of the historic house retains its integrity, but the interior has been significantly modified. Mr. Straw stated that he planned to add only one penetration through the party wall on each floor. He will also leave the brick of the former exterior wall exposed in the interior. He also noted that the addition will have its own mechanical systems to avoid too many connections with the old house. He reported that it would have a simple shingled appearance and would not be mistaken as part of the older building. Mr. Straw remarked that the exterior color scheme would be neutral.

Mr. Straw explained that the National Park Service, which owns part of the site, had approved of the project with some minor changes, which he had already made to the plans. Ms. Barucco also noted that they had met with Mr. Danta and incorporated his suggestions into their plans.

Ms. Pentz inquired if the property has a basement. Mr. Straw replied that it does have a full basement.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the roof of the addition would rise above the existing party wall. Mr. Straw responded that, although it appeared as if it did in the drawing, the addition roof, in fact, meets the historic roof. Mr. Thomas inquired about gutters and downspouts. The applicant stated they had not designed the water collection system yet.

Ms. Voith inquired about the budget for materials. She stated that the choices were too modest. Mr. Straw responded that he wanted the design to be simple. He also noted that

the pastor and her husband are paying for the renovations themselves from the proceeds of the sale of their home in Jenkintown. Ms. Voith explained to the applicants that it would be difficult to use the fibro-cement siding in such long runs. In her experience, this type of siding must be broken with occasional verticals because it is difficult to join pieces of the siding seamlessly. Mr. Straw stated he would restudy this aspect.

Ms. Pentz inquired about the existing roofing materials. Mr. Straw stated that it probably dates to the early twentieth century.

Mr. McCoubrey returned to the question of the intersection of the new and old roofs. He suggested that the historic parapet at the rear ell be revealed above the addition roof. Mr. Straw stated that he would incorporate Mr. McCoubrey's suggested change.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

2240-48 N. BROAD STREET

Owner: Uptown Entertainment Development Corporation

Applicant: Jane Golden, Mural Arts Program

History: 1927-1929, Magaziner, Eberhard & Harris, architects

Project: Legalize mural

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize a mural on the south party wall of the Uptown Theater. The Architectural Committee reviewed an identical application at its April 2006 meeting and recommended denial. The applicant withdrew that application before the Commission reviewed it. The party wall was stuccoed and painted white at the time of designation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Section 6.8.A.4 of the Commission's *Rules & Regulations*; the size and scale of the mural are not compatible with the historic building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Jane Golden, the director of the Mural Arts Program, and Amy Johnston and Cathy Harris, also of the Mural Arts Program, represented the application.

Ms. Golden provided a history of the mural project. The mural is intended to commemorate musical acts that have performed at the Uptown Theater. It is part of the "Sounds of Philadelphia," a larger project sponsored by WXPB. She acknowledged that she did not check to see if the building was designated as historic before beginning the project. She stated that she did not believe that it was historic. In response to assertions that the mural is too large and complicated for the façade, she explained that the original conception for the mural included the depictions of 500 musicians. She reported that she had worked hard to simplify the mural. Ms. Golden explained to the Committee that she would like to reach a compromise on the mural. Perhaps it could be approved on a temporary basis. She opined that it would be "sad" to remove it immediately.

Mr. Thomas explained that the Commission is empowered to negotiate compromises; the Committee is not. He stated that the Committee is charged with determining whether the project complies with historic preservation standards.

Mr. Thomas remarked that supporting the revitalization of the Uptown and surrounding area is very important. However, he concluded, the mural is not appropriate in the size and scale. It overwhelms the historic building. He stated that he would recommend denial. Ms. Voith agreed, stating that the mural does not satisfy the technical standards. Mr. Thomas suggested that the murals recently completed on the Royal Theater on South Street near his office might serve as models for appropriate murals on historic buildings. Mr. Farnham commented that the Royal Theater is designated. He noted that he was unaware of any murals on the Royal Theater and that he did not recall a review of murals for the building by the Commission.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Section 6.8.A.4 of the Commission's *Rules & Regulations*.

1627 SPRUCE STREET, UNIT 2

Owner/Applicant: Jeffrey Brydzinski

History: Built c. 1850, Designated in 2/8/1995

Project: Replace wood windows with clad windows.

1627 SPRUCE STREET, UNIT 3

Owner/Applicant: Phillip Pierce

History: Built c. 1850, Designated in 2/8/1995

Project: Replace wood windows with clad windows.

OVERVIEW: These applications propose to replace the existing one-over-one wood windows in the main façade of this building with Pella Architect series one-over-one clad windows. The applicants have already placed orders for the clad windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of both applications, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposals to the Committee. Jeffrey Brydzinski, one of the owners, represented the applications.

Mr. Brydzinski recalled a conversation with the previous owners, during which he asked if the property was designated as historic. He was told it was not. The previous owner assured him that he would be able to replace the windows. The applicant also notified other tenants in the building and received their approval to replace the windows. Mr. Brydzinski stated that he also contacted the condominium management office, which informed him that it was not a historical property and that the Pella windows were acceptable. Pella manufactured the windows after the applicant paid a \$15,000.00 deposit.

Mr. Thomas asked which windows had been replaced. Mr. Brydzinski stated that the second, third, and fourth-floor windows had been replaced. He reported a conversation with Pella, during which he was told that the new windows would be almost identical to the historic windows. Mr. Brydzinski selected the Pella windows, which cost more than

other options, because they better replicated the historic windows. Mr. Brydzinski noted that the extant windows are deteriorating. He also commented on the safety reasons for replacing them.

Mr. Baron informed the Committee and applicant that the Pennsylvania real estate disclosure form includes a section on historic designation. Mr. Brydzinski confirmed that the disclosure form did not indicate that his was a historic property. Mr. Baron noted that the correct windows should be two-over-two not one-over-one windows. He then explained to the applicant that the Commission typically guides owners toward restoration of windows as they rehabilitate their properties.

Mr. Thomas concurred with Mr. Baron that the windows should be two-over-two sash and that the owner should have consulted with the Commission before undertaking any work. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the drawings indicate that two different types of windows are proposed. Mr. Brydzinski stated that Phillip Pierce, the owner of Unit 3, was proposing a slightly different window. Mr. McCoubrey remarked that the windows are very different. Ms. Voith pointed out the differences. Ms. Voith also stated that she could not determine precisely which windows had been ordered from the documentation provided.

Mr. Baron stated that the Commission's *Rules and Regulations* require shop drawings for window reviews. He explained that shop drawings would indicate if the opening sizes were being reduced and where, relative to the plane of the façade, the windows would be located. Mr. Brydzinski said he would relay the information to Mr. Pierce.

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

223-225 S. 6TH STREET, DILWORTH HOUSE

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: Demolish 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 16-story residential building at the rear of the site. The new building would connect to the historic building at the east and wrap around it at the north. The new building would cantilever over the historic building above the third story.

The current proposal is the fourth for this project. The first proposed in concept to completely demolish the house and construct a 15-story residential building in its place. The Architectural Committee reviewed the application in July 2005 and recommended denial. In August 2005, the Commission tabled the application for a period not to exceed six months. The applicant withdrew the proposal prior to a review before the Commission.

The second proposed in concept to completely demolish the house and construct a 15-story residential building in its place. A portion of the front façade of the historic building would have been reconstructed at the ground-level arcade of the new building. The Architectural Committee reviewed the application in February 2006 and recommended denial. In March 2006, the Commission tabled the application. The applicant withdrew the proposal prior to a review upon submission of the fourth proposal.

The third, which was never officially submitted to the Commission but which was distributed to the Architectural Committee and Commission members by the applicant in February 2006, proposed retaining most of the Dilworth House and erecting an apartment building at the rear of the lot. The Architectural Committee refused to offer a recommendation on the unofficial proposal.

In parallel with the initial in-concept application, the applicant proposed the reclassification of the Dilworth House from a significant property to a non-contributing building and a contributing site. The Committee on Historic Designation reviewed the reclassification application in July 2005 and recommended denial of the application and the reaffirmation of the significant classification. The Commission continued the reclassification application and has not yet reviewed it. The applicant now requests that that “the Historical Commission postpone consideration of that [reclassification] request pending its decision on our current application for final approval.”

In September 2003, the Commission reviewed an application from the current owner to rehabilitate the house as his residence. At that time, the Commission approved the demolition of the rear wing of the house. However, it also required that the new construction at the rear, excepting the chimney, be invisible from 6th Street or Washington Square above the original 2-story stair tower at the north. The Commission’s minute reads as follows:

Mr. Wilds made a motion to approve the proposed design, provided that the balconette at the 3rd story of the south façade was replaced with a simple guard rail not extending out beyond the plane of the façade, that the roofline of the rear wing was changed to a gable or A-frame shape, that the chimney was redesigned to harmonize with the Colonial Revival building, and that none of the new rear wing except the chimney was visible from 6th Street or Washington Square above the original 2-story stair tower at the north, with staff to review details. Mr. Huff seconded the motion, which passed 8 to 2. Mr. Rivera and Mr. Steinberg opposed the motion; Mr. Sklaroff recused himself.

The current application, which is a significant improvement over the previous applications from a preservation perspective, proposes to retain much of the historic building. However, it proposes to demolish both the rear wing, which was previously approved, albeit as part of a very different application, and the original 2-story stair tower mentioned in the Commission decision of 2003. The stair tower fronts on Washington Square and is an original, character-defining feature of the house.

Section 14-2007(2)(f) defines demolition as the “razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building.” The proposed demolition may constitute demolition “in significant part.” If it does, the hardship-public interest test must be applied. It is enumerated in Section 14-2007(7)(j) of the Philadelphia Code and reads:

No permit shall be issued for the demolition [as defined in Section 14-2007(2)(f)] of ... a building ... located within a historic district which contributes, in the Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Commission finds that issuance of a permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

Putting aside the question of demolition momentarily, the architectural merits of the new construction must be addressed. The proposed 16-story building may not be compatible with the remainder of the historic building in size, scale, proportion, or massing. Standing against it and cantilevering over it, the proposed tower may overwhelm the remaining piece of the historic building.

Finally, the application materials submitted for final approval 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. In fact, the current architectural drawings are labeled "CONCEPT DESIGN" in the lower right-hand corner. However, a cover letter accompanying the application notes that this is "an application for final approval." 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.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff recommends denial, owing to the significant demolition and the incompatible nature of the new construction, pursuant to Section 14-2007(7)(j) of the Philadelphia Code and Standards 2, 9, 10, and the Building Site Guidelines. The staff suggests two improvements to the current design, that the historic north stair tower be retained and adapted as the entrance to the condominium building and that the condominium building be shifted to the east away from the historic building to avoid cantilevering over it. The staff also suggests that any proposal for final approval be fully documented with detailed architectural drawings.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey recused; their firms, Keast & Hood and Venturi Scott Brown, are both involved in the project.

Mr. Farnham noted that, because two members recused, the Architectural Committee no longer had a quorum. Neil Sklaroff, attorney for the owner, agreed to proceed with the review without a quorum. Mr. Gallery objected to the lack of a quorum and asked that the record indicate that the recommendation is that of two individuals, not the Committee. Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association also objected to the lack of a quorum.

Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the members of the Committee. Along with Mr. Sklaroff, owner John Turchi, consultant Craig Schelter, and architects Carey Yonce and Rebecca Vieyra represented the application.

During his introduction, Mr. Farnham noted a discrepancy in the application. The architectural drawings are labeled "CONCEPT DESIGN," but a cover letter requests "final approval" of the application. Mr. Sklaroff requested that the Commission review this application as an in-concept application. He explained that he had planned to present

additional details for the project once the developer had reached an agreement with the neighborhood group, but that agreement was never reached. He added that he does not consider the proposed demolition to be a substantial or significant demolition.

Ms. Voith asked about the history of the Dilworth House. Mr. Farnham replied that G. Edwin Brumbaugh designed and constructed the house for Mayor Richardson Dilworth and his wife in late 1956 and 1957. Ms. Voith asked about the buildings demolished to clear the site for the Dilworth House. Mr. Farnham described the buildings as two early nineteenth-century row houses. Ms. Voith then noted that the Dilworth House was not quite 50 years old. Mr. Farnham explained that the Philadelphia Historical Commission does not subscribe to the National Register's 50-year rule. He stated that the house was designated as part of the Society Hill Historic District. The District's period of significance includes the redevelopment of Society Hill, which occurred from the 1950s to the 1970s. Mr. Schelter reported that the first application ever approved by the Commission was for the demolition of the two rowhouses replaced by the Dilworth House. Mr. Farnham corrected Mr. Schelter, explaining that the rowhouses were not designated and therefore not under the jurisdiction of the Commission. The Commission had not approved their demolition, but instead had approved the shoring of the Athenaeum, which was designated; its south party wall was exposed by the demolition.

Mr. Yonce presented the architectural proposal. He spoke of the context, especially the various types and sizes of buildings around Washington Square. He explained that the developer plans to retain the main body of the house. He objected to the staff's statement that the tower would cantilever over the house. He said that the tower does cantilever, but the "cantilever is not over the house." He explained that the tower only extends two or three feet out over the house. By extending over the house, the tower will engage with the house, he explained. He stated that the tower would also engage with the historic building with its wing wall, which would extend around the house at the north. He said that the tower would extend out to the square with this wall. The wing wall would also reinforce the sidewalk line. He noted the structural problems with the Athenaeum and reported that Keast & Hood had been engaged to repair the shared wall. He explained that the demolition of the north or stair wing is necessary; the demolition would allow for the repair of the Athenaeum wall and would provide for an entrance to the tower. The south side yard is narrower and would not allow for an appropriate and gracious entrance. He stated that they planned to retain the fence at the south side and move the monument from the north to the south. Mr. Yonce noted that the building would be faced with masonry and would include brownstone, like the Athenaeum. In response to a question from Ms. Voith, Mr. Yonce explained that the tower would include 11 residential floors and a two-story penthouse. It is a 14-story, not a 16-story, building; they do not count the mezzanine levels.

Mr. Schelter explained that the remaining portion of the ground floor of the Dilworth House would be used as a sitting room for the condominium building. It would be accessed from the lobby and would be restored to its original appearance. Mr. Schelter asserted that the north wing, which was slated for demolition, was not a character-defining feature of the house. He stated that it was not able to be seen in the famous photograph of Mayor Dilworth leaving his house, which was presented to the Commission at an earlier meeting. He stated that it was important from an urban design perspective to bring the new building out to the sidewalk line and to the square. Dilworth House is set back four feet from the sidewalk line. He also noted that Mr. Turchi sought to bring a "luxury product" to the market, not an apartment building. He explained that

the cantilevering of the tower over the house would allow the afternoon sun to shine into the lobby.

Ms. Voith asked why the cladding on the north party wall only extended three-quarters of the way up the shared wall with the Athenaeum. Mr. Yonce stated that this portion of the design was not yet complete. Mr. Schelter noted that the cladding on the party wall extended up to and reflected the cantilevering of the tower. Ms. Voith responded that cladding design looked like a woman's slip that was showing.

Mr. Thomas remarked that the south elevation of the tower is a big, blank wall. He asked if the architect planned to articulate it in any way. Mr. Yonce replied that they may propose a pattern, but added that the elevator and service core, which is behind the wall, accounts for its unarticulated nature.

Ms. Voith commended the applicant for their compromise solution. Mr. Yonce replied that Robert Venturi does not perceive the latest design as a compromise; he is very happy with it. Ms. Voith expressed her appreciation for their attempt to bring the main entrance out to Washington Square. She also stated that the front façade of the tower is appropriate for the context. Ms. Voith stated clearly for the record that these were her personal opinions from an "urbanistic standpoint." She also stated that she preferred their first design, which required the complete demolition of the house. She stated that the demolition of the north and rear wings would allow the entrance to the tower to the wider of the two side yards and activate an unused space. She then noted that, as a member of the Architectural Committee, her job was to review the application from a preservation perspective, not an urban design perspective.

Mr. Thomas asked if the tower would house condominiums. Mr. Turchi responded that it would. Mr. Thomas asked him why he had shifted from the apartment proposal. Mr. Turchi did not answer Mr. Thomas's question, but he did explain that, if moved to the rear of the lot, the tower would block the light to Randolph Street. He also noted that it would block the windows on the north wall of the Lippincott regardless of its location on the lot. He stated that Robert Venturi's approach is "attractive" and "would be an asset to the square." He explained that the upper floors of the Dilworth House will be inaccessible once they demolish the north wing. He reported that they will be lighted, but not occupied. Mr. Thomas noted the buildings at Pennsylvania Hospital, which have unoccupied floors, and suggested that the developer find a way to use the upper floors of the Dilworth House. Mr. Schelter offered to design screens for the upper windows to make the space look occupied.

Ms. Voith supported the demolition of the stair tower and construction of the tower with the cantilever. Mr. Thomas agreed with Ms. Voith and commented that the cantilever would engage without overwhelming. Ms. Voith stated that the base-middle-top configuration of the tower was appropriate.

Mr. Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association addressed the members of the Committee. He asserted that the first floor of the Dilworth House would not be active or accessed from the street; the front door to the Dilworth House would not be operational. He stated that the rear portion of the house, with its "garden in the city," was an important part of the Dilworth House and was featured prominently in the press at the time of construction. He contended that the proposed demolition was not "legal." He noted that the application defined the work as "alteration," not demolition. He read from the

ordinance, stating that alteration was reroofing, pointing, and masonry cleaning, but not the work proposed in the current application. He reminded the members of the Committee that the Architectural Committee had opposed the demolition of the rear wing when the current owner proposed to convert the house to his residence in 2003. Mr. Boni opined that the blank south wall of the building is “offensive.” He suggested that it could be redesigned and commented that the developer is attempting to fit too much program on the site. He objected to the height of the proposed tower and claimed that it is “grossly disproportionate” to the house. He noted that a tall rear addition was discussed in 2003, during the review of the proposed Turchi residence, but that notion was not seriously considered and humorously rejected by the Committee. Discussing the reclassification application, Mr. Boni stated that the Designation Committee had voted unanimously to recommend its classification of Significant be retained. Mr. Farnham noted that the reclassification application had been tabled by the Commission without a review of the merits.

Steven Wexler, also of the Society Hill Civic Association, addressed the members of the Committee. He stated that the proposal does not comply with Standard 9. The Standard requires that new construction not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The demolition would destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships. The tower is not compatible with its neighbors; it is not in scale with the historic building. He also remarked that the tower would block light to the Athenaeum, rendering its grand stairway dark.

Mr. Gallery of the Preservation Alliance addressed the members of the Committee. He expressed his appreciation to Messrs. Turchi and Sklaroff for shifting their application from a final to an in-concept review. He also reported that the latest design is a substantial improvement over the earlier designs. However, he supported the staff’s recommendation of denial. He stated that he was disappointed by today’s discussion by the members of the Committee. He contended that the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards are very clear and that this proposal does not meet the Standards. He stated that the application proposes demolishing 50% of the historic building and the new construction is not compatible in size, scale, proportion, or massing. He asserted that the members of the Committee had no choice but to recommend denial of the proposal. He discussed the differences between alteration and demolition. He stated that an alteration leaves the “essential functional character” of the historic fabric intact. He asserted that this application proposes demolition, not adaptive reuse. He admonished the Committee members, telling that that, unless they establish a new standard, they must recommend denial. He noted that the proposal included some positive aspects, but asserted that others are conceptually inappropriate. He displayed photographs of the new towers at 110-112 S. Front Street, 101 Walnut Street, and 108 Arch Street and noted the inappropriate scale and blank party walls on the first two. He opined that 108 Arch is inappropriately scaled but the party walls are articulated with windows and other features. He then suggested that the architect “flip” the plan for the Dilworth tower, moving the setbacks and windows to the south and the core to the north. He displayed his own architectural drawings of the revised plan. He argued that the south wall will be very visible, but the north wall will not. He also suggested that the building would be more marketable with windows on the south, rather than the north. He reiterated that the current concept, with the core at the south, is fundamentally flawed. He concluded that the members of the Committee must recommend denial of the proposal because it does not satisfy the Standards, because of the significant demolition, and because the floor plan is inappropriate. Mr. Thomas remarked that flipping the plan does not solve the

question of the demolition. Mr. Gallery agreed and asserted that the design questions should not be addressed until the demolition question is answered. He added that the blank south wall is the fundamental design flaw.

Ronald Patterson, an attorney representing nearby property owners, opposed the project. He noted that the proposed tower is not appropriately scaled for the site. He also objected to the south wall.

Historic preservationist Suzanna Barucco supported the positions of the Society Hill Civic Association and the Preservation Alliance and opposed the project. She stated that it would be inappropriate to demolish the north wing of the house. She added that the tower is inappropriately scaled.

Mr. Sklaroff asserted that the Commission has already approved the demolition. He also contended that the north wing or stair tower is not significant. He asked the members of the Committee to put the legal question aside and review the concept of the proposal. Mr. Schelter stated that the new building must be reviewed in the context of Washington Square, not solely in the Dilworth House context. He asserted that it is compatible with both Dilworth House and Washington Square. Addressing the south party wall, he stated that the Committee should only consider the views of the new building from public streets, not the views from adjacent buildings. Views from private property should play no role in the Committee's deliberations. He contended that the blank south wall would not be visible from many locations on public streets.

Mr. Thomas concluded that the Commission, not the Committee, must decide whether the demolition proposed constitutes a "significant" demolition in the legal sense. He commented that he personally did consider the demolition of the north and rear wings to constitute a "significant" demolition. He also stated that, if the Commission accepts the demolition, it should require some changes to improve the proposal. He noted especially that the blank south wall should be articulated. Ms. Voith suggested that the architect prepare a site plan that includes all of Washington Square, which could be used as the basis for an analysis of the views.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee recommended that the Commission determine whether the proposed demolition constitutes a demolition "in significant part" under Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code. If the Commission finds that it constitutes a demolition "in significant part," the members of the Architectural Committee recommend denial. If it does not constitute a demolition "in significant part," they recommend approval in concept, provided the design is revised as outlined above, especially the south wall.

Ms. Voith excused herself from the Committee.

7500 GERMANTOWN AVENUE, NEW COVENANT CHURCH

Owner: New Covenant Church

Applicant: Van Strother, staff architect, New Covenant Church

History: originally Wissinoming Hall of the Pennsylvania School for the Deaf, Wilson Brothers, 1890-1892

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of an elevator tower, covered entranceway, and pergola for one of the main buildings of the former Pennsylvania School for the Deaf, now the New Covenant Church. The Wilson Brothers, a prominent architectural and engineering firm, designed this and other large stone buildings on the pastoral campus at the same time it designed the significant Reading Terminal on the 1100-block of Market Street.

The application offers two alternatives for the tower. One alternative proposes an exterior tower that would stand at the rear of the building. It would obstruct several windows and a door, cut through the large overhanging eave, and impede the view of a dormer. The second alternative proposes an interior tower that would rise above the roofline. The new entranceway would replace a window. A pergola would be added flanking the doorway and elevator tower. Scant details are provided, especially for the interior elevator, which would have a significant exterior component. Annotated demolition and construction drawings including elevations, plans, and sections should be provided detailing all aspects of the project such as the extent of demolition and the proposed materials for the new construction.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to incompleteness.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the proposal to the Committee. Van Strother, the staff architect at New Covenant Church, represented the application.

Mr. Strother stated that the church is seeking to make Founder's Hall (formerly Wissinoming Hall) accessible. This building currently houses church offices, the Sunday school, and a day care program. There is currently no elevator in the building; stairways provide the only access to the five floors. Mr. Strother stated that he has submitted an application to the Zoning Board for the elevator project. Mr. Strother explained that he had first prepared the proposal for an exterior elevator shaft. Mr. Baron of the Commission's staff reviewed the proposal and suggested that Mr. Strother prepare a plan for an interior elevator shaft. Mr. Strother stated that his employer prefers the exterior elevator.

Mr. Farnham asked Mr. Strother to provide the details missing from the application. He noted the lack of information on materials. Mr. Strother explained that the elevator shaft would be faced with a split block, which would be compatible with the historic stone building. He also explained that the pergola was intended to soften the transition from the parking lot to the building. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the new rear entrance. Mr. Strother replied that it was intended to be the new main entrance to the building. He noted that the original main entrance at the front of the building is monumental and is located at the top of a large flight of stairs. Ms. Pentz asked about the stairs within the building. Mr. Strother replied that there are two and pointed to them on a plan.

Mr. Strother disagreed with the staff recommendation and asserted that he had provided enough information for a complete review. Mr. Thomas countered that Mr. Strother may have provided enough information for a review in concept, but not for a review for final approval. He asked Mr. Strother to comment on the disadvantages of an interior elevator. Mr. Strother provided a rendering of the interior shaft emerging through the roof. He stated that installing an elevator in the interior would negatively impact interior spaces such as the first-floor lobby. Mr. Thomas asked what type of elevator Mr. Strother planned to use. He stated that it would be a five-stop elevator; it would be either a hydraulic or traction elevator. Mr. Thomas concluded that an interior elevator would probably cost much less than an exterior elevator. He noted that the appropriate preservation solution would also be economical. He asked about the use of the fifth floor. Mr. Strother replied that it is not currently used.

Ms. Pentz asked about the new entrance. Mr. Strother reported that it would be necessary regardless of the location of the elevator. He stated that they now use the narrow rear door as the main door. Mr. Thomas asked about the width of that door. Mr. Strother replied that it is less than 36 inches wide. Ms. Pentz asked about the fire escape. Mr. Strother responded that he believed that they needed to retain it, but was not certain. The fire escape would be modified to avoid the new main entrance.

Mr. Strother asked the Committee to comment on the exterior portion of an interior shaft, which would project through the roof among the many dormers and chimneys. Mr. Thomas noted that the exterior portion would be preferable to an exterior shaft. He also noted that the exterior shaft would require a lengthy bridge at the fifth or top floor to bring passengers from the elevator to the interior space under the roof. Mr. Thomas reiterated that the interior solution would be less expensive and easier to construct.

Laura Siena, the executive director of West Mt. Airy Neighbors, introduced herself and stated that her organization is monitoring the project. She asked the staff to clarify the Committee's comments. Mr. Farnham stated that the Committee had indicated that it would recommend denial of the exterior elevator proposal, but would recommend approval of an interior elevator if complete information was provided. He also noted that the Committee was not recommending denial of any exterior elevator, but only the one submitted. He explained that if, after further investigation, Mr. Strother determined that an interior elevator was infeasible, he could present a new application for an exterior elevator. He also stated that the Committee would review the entrance and pergola designs after the elevator question had been answered. Mr. Strother asked the staff to outline his options for the current application. Mr. Farnham stated that he could either lobby the Commission for approval of his current proposal at its August meeting or withdraw his application and develop a new proposal that responded to the Committee's suggestions. He advised Mr. Strother that any subsequent application must be complete.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the project as submitted, but to recommend approval of an interior elevator as outlined, provided complete information on the design is submitted, with the staff to review details.

Mr. Thomas excused himself from the Committee.

2232 GREEN STREET

Owner: 2235 Green Street Acquisition, LP

Applicant: Sol Dembinsky

History: built c. 1856, Contributing in Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize vinyl windows, deck rail, and add stone details to front

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installment of vinyl windows, a new side door, and the railing of the roof deck. Approximately 10 existing vinyl windows were replaced with new vinyl windows throughout the building. The rotting wood rail of the roof deck was replaced with pressure treated wood and spindles were added. This application also proposes to surround the front entrance with a limestone look molding and a similar limestone element to be placed under the first floor windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the windows, door, and molding around the door owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. Approval of the roof deck railing, with the staff to review details.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote explained that the Architectural Committee lacked quorum. No one objected to proceeding without quorum.

Ms. Cote presented the application to the members of the Architectural Committee. The applicant did not attend the meeting.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the roof deck was recently constructed. Ms. Cote answered that the deck existed and that the only recent work had been the installation of new spindles to the rail.

Ms. Pentz asked why the applicant proposed new moldings for the door surround. Ms. Cote explained that the applicant wanted to recreate an Italianate door surround, a common feature of the neighborhood.

Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey concurred with staff's recommendation to approve the deck railing but deny the remainder of the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the windows, door, and molding around the door owing to incompleteness and pursuant to Standards 6 and 9; and approval of the roof deck railing, with the staff to review details.

11 S. 5TH STREET A.K.A 111 S. INDEPENDENCE MALL EAST (THE BOURSE)

Owner: Bourse Mall Associates

Applicant: Mike Marino

History: Built in 1893-95, G.W. & W.D. Hewitt, Architects, Designated 1/26/1971

Project: Alter window into door

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove an existing window on the west façade of the building, the fifth street elevation, and replace it with a new glass and aluminum door with a sidelight and transom. The proposed door is the same type as the doors that currently exist on the façade. The finish of the door is to match that of the existing

aluminum frame doors. The proposed installment/replacement will not alter the existing masonry opening.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as submitted, pursuant to Standard 9, but approval of a centered door without a transom.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote explained that the Architectural Committee lacked quorum. No one objected to proceeding without quorum.

Ms. Cote presented the application to the members of the Architectural Committee. The applicant did not attend the meeting.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the opening is too wide for a single-leaf door alone and not wide enough for a double-leaf door that would meet ADA regulations. He stated that the transom is inappropriate. Mr. McCoubrey suggested a single-leaf door with one sidelight but no transom. He suggested that the frame to match the existing entrance doors to the left of the subject opening. Ms. Pentz agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of a single-leaf door with one sidelight to fill the opening, but no transom, with the frame to match the adjacent door frame at the main entrance, with the staff to review details.

115 N. ORIANNA STREET

Owner/Applicant: William Vessal

History: built c. 1870. Contributing, Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003

Project: Add penthouse

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a 1,765 square-foot penthouse addition on the roof of this three-story building. The penthouse would be one-story and set back 11'-6' from the Orianna Street façade. The addition would be clad in wood siding, metal siding, stucco or a combination thereof. A window wall with a wood lattice shade device would span a large portion of the Orianna Street façade of the penthouse. This façade would also have an unshaded window and a small square window in the northern portion of the facade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote explained that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Ms. Cote presented the application to the members of the Architectural Committee. William Vessal, the applicant, represented the application.

Ms. Cote explained the standards on which the staff had based their recommendation of denial. Mr. Vessal explained that he needs the extra space for the future growth of his family and requested that the Committee suggest revisions to the design that would yield a recommendation for approval.

Ms. Pentz noted that the proposed setback was acceptable, but that the height of the penthouse was problematic because it would render it highly conspicuous. Mr. Vessal noted that he proposed a nine-foot ceiling height and that, owing to the pitch of the roof and the need for space for mechanical equipment, the height at the ridge would increase to 14'. Mr. McCoubrey mentioned that the height of the roof should be no more than 11' maximum. An 11-foot ridgeline would allow the applicant to retain a ceiling height of 9'. Mr. Vessal noted that a total height of 12' would be best in order to accommodate the air conditioning ductwork. Mr. McCoubrey noted that 11' appeared sufficient. He suggested that, if the architect could not accommodate that height, then the Committee would reconsider the question with a subsequent proposal. Mr. Vessal pressed for a taller penthouse. Mr. McCoubrey suggested an 11-foot roof height for the westernmost 6' of the penthouse and then a step up to 14' for the eastern section of the penthouse. The taller rear section would not be visible over the shorter front section. Mr. Vessal agreed with this proposal. Mr. McCoubrey inquired about the materials for the exterior of the penthouse. Mr. Vessal answered that he would like to use stucco. Ms. Pentz noted that stucco in a neutral color was an acceptable choice. Mr. McCoubrey suggested incorporating as much glass as possible.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, provided the roof height is limited to 11' for the westernmost 6' of the penthouse and is limited to 14' for the remaining, eastern portion of the penthouse.

1537 PINE STREET

Owner: 200 Christian Street Partners

Applicant: Craig Deutsch, Harman Deutsch Architects

History: built c. 1865. Contributing, Rittenhouse/Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Rear alterations, Fourth floor terrace

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to the rear of this four-story Italianate rowhouse. At the first floor, the application proposes removing a single-leaf door and window and adding centered French doors flanked by fixed French doors. Transoms would top the entire expanse of the French doors. A wrought iron terrace and railing with steps is proposed at the French doors. At the second floor, two sets of doors with transoms would be installed. They would open onto a balcony extending across both sets of doors. At the third floor, new sash are proposed in the existing frames. These windows would be six-over-six, simulated-divided-light windows. On the fourth floor, a terrace is proposed. The construction of the terrace involves removing the rear portion of the roof and the wood panel system. A wrought iron railing would span the opening at the historic façade plane. The existing cornice would remain. New French doors would be added approximately 14 feet from the rear façade to create access to the terrace from the interior of the building.

This application also proposes masonry repointing and cleaning as well as new windows for the front façade of the building. The following sash kits are proposed: one-over-one, true-divided-light at the first floor; two-over-two, true-divided-light at the second floor; and two-over-two simulated-divided-light at the third and fourth floors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The staff would recommend approval of true-divided-light windows throughout, with the staff to review details.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote explained that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. The applicant and the public did not object to proceeding without a quorum.

Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Craig Deutsch and Paul Drazl as well as Scott Yohe, an owner's representative, represented the application.

Mr. Deutsch provided an overview of the proposal. He stated that his client sought to improve the flow and plan; to gain outdoor space; and to add value.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the visibility of the rear of the building. Mr. Baron mentioned that the rear of this property faced an alley and that it was visible from 16th Street. He also noted that this is a very intact mid nineteenth-century row. The architectural importance supersedes questions of visibility. Mr. Deutsch noted that this property was the third from the corner and that the only clear visibility is from the mentioned eight-foot-wide alley. He also noted that he is moving, not demolishing historic fabric at the fourth floor.

Mr. Baron noted that the proposed second-story balconies would remove historic fabric without providing much in return to the residents. He stated that the balcony is too narrow to stand on and therefore does not justify the large new openings for the doors. Mr. Deutsch stated that he could enlarge the balcony. Mr. Drazl noted that they would be willing to redesign that feature. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with the staff. Mr. Yohe inquired whether a walkout balcony at the second-floor rear would be acceptable. Mr. McCoubrey answered that it would be a significant change to that façade. Ms. Pentz stated that the second and fourth floors should not be altered as proposed; they should be retained intact. Mr. McCoubrey opined that it would be acceptable to enlarge the first-floor window, but the first-floor door should be retained as well.

Mr. McCoubrey noted that the proposed fourth-floor alterations would completely change the character of that rear façade. He also noted that cutting a large hole in the roof and façade would create maintenance problems. Mr. Deutsch explained that the wood would be treated to withstand the elements. Mr. Yohe reported that the wood elements at the fourth floor are not historic, but are a relatively new addition. Mr. Deutsch asked the Committee members if they would accept the cutting of the roof if the fourth-floor rear façade was maintained in place. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he believed that it would create a significant preservation problem. Mr. Deutsch responded that the fourth-floor rear is not historic. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that it would be less invasive to add a roof deck than to remove the façade and roof at the rear of this building.

Mr. Deutsch lobbied for the approval of the project. He stated that he was "trying to keep the feel of the flavor" of the historic building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of enlarging the first-floor rear window and altering the rear stairs to the patio, provided the existing door is maintained; denial of all simulated-divided-light windows, but approval of true-divided-light windows, with the staff to review details; and denial of all other proposed alterations to the roof and rear façade including the first-floor French doors and steps, second-floor balconies and doors, and fourth-floor demolition and deck construction.

602 S. FRONT STREET

Owner/Applicant: William K. Stewart

History: built c. 1795. Designation 6/24/1958

Project: Install new marble steps

OVERVIEW: This application proposes remove the existing steps and replacing them with white marble steps with a railing. The top step would be installed in the masonry of the building and measure the width of the door frame. The bottom step would measure 2'-8" by 5'-4". An iron railing would protrude to the edge of the step from the building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as submitted, pursuant to Standard 9. The staff would recommend approval of steps that fit within the door opening and a railing with vertical members, but no oval element.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote explained that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum.

Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the members of the Architectural Committee. The applicant was unable to attend the meeting.

Mr. Baron explained that the current steps consist of one piece of marble and one piece of granite. Mr. Barron stated that the building was originally a house. A storefront was added; the granite step dates to the storefront era. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the threshold appeared to be raised and of a different material.

Ms. Pentz stated that she could recommend approval of the proposal as submitted. Mr. McCoubrey opined that the upper step should be the full width of the opening; the jambs should not extend down to the step. He asserted that the top step should be as wide as the opening; the bottom step could be slightly wider to accept the railing.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, but approval of a top step as wide as the door opening, a slightly wider bottom step, and a plain simple black railing with vertical pickets, but no ovals, with the staff to review details.

56-60 N. 2ND STREET, 209 CUTHBERT STREET

Owner: Kevin Wentworth, Normandy/806 SAR Philadelphia Portfolio

Applicant: Richard Thom

History: 56-60 N. 2nd Street, built 1836, new façade and enlargement to factory for Tuttleman Brothers and Faggen in 1900-01, Thomas Stephen, architect

Project: Replace windows; rehabilitate storefront

OVERVIEW: This application proposes windows for the many facades of this complex as shown on the enclosed plan. The applicants seek to replace most of the windows in their historic configuration in wood with some exceptions. On the front façade, there are currently some arched windows on the fourth and fifth floors which appear in photographs of the 1970s. Upon closer inspection, staff thought that the fifth floor windows at least were mid twentieth-century designs. On the light-court off Cuthbert

Street, which is surrounded by three pieces of this building complex, the applicant proposes aluminum windows with square heads, even where there are currently arch-top windows. Similarly, the applicant proposes the aluminum square-head windows for the façade facing Little Boys Way again in a location that historically had arch-head windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6. The staff suggests that the applicant install square-head windows on the front facade unless additional evidence can be found to justify the decorative rounded or fanlight decoration at the fourth and fifth floors and arch-head windows in the courtyard on the three bays closest to the street as well as the windows facing Little Boys Way.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron explained to the applicants and audience that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. No one objected to proceeding with the review without a quorum.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the members of the Architectural Committee. Architect Richard Thom, Steve Bochín, and Leo Addimando represented the application.

Mr. Thom explained the coding scheme he developed for his plans to overcome the complexity of the site. Referring to the elevation coded as A, the Cuthbert Street elevation, Mr. Thom stated that they had originally wanted to extend the fan windows. Mr. Baron explained that, upon inspection, the arched windows on the fifth floor of the Cuthbert Street façade were added during the twentieth century. He concluded that they are not historic and should not be replicated. Mr. Thom concurred and stated that he would revise his plans to indicate the historic, square-head configuration for the front façade.

Mr. Thom then discussed the windows in the light-court that runs north from Cuthbert. The elevations are coded as B, C, and D elevations. After surveying 85 per cent of the buildings windows, they discovered what they called a “hodgepodge” of replacement windows installed in 1979 and 1980 when it was rehabilitated by Landmarks for Living. The replacement windows are failing. He stated that his client is prepared to spend a large amount of money to replace the windows on elevations E, F, G, H, I, and J, to match the historic, meaning arch-top, thermal glazing, and true-divided-light, in exchange for some relief in the light-court. Mr. Thom noted that staff is recommending that the historic windows be installed in the first three bays in from Cuthbert Street on the D elevation. Mr. Thom then commented that he is proposing a handsome restoration of the entire building. He asked to have all the windows square-top on the D elevation in exchange for installing historic windows on the K elevation at the rear of the building facing Little Boys Way. Although Mr. Thom acknowledged the light-court is minimally visible from the street, he would appreciate some relief in this area. He stated that he is replacing 280 windows on the building, which will be very expensive.

Mr. Baron asked Mr. Thom about his plans for the rope molding on the windows at the end of the light court. Mr. Thom agreed to retain and repair the rope molding.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of aluminum square-top windows at all of Elevations B and C and most of D, provided that wood true-divided-light arch-top windows are installed at the two southernmost (closest to Cuthbert) bays of Elevation D;

wood true-divided-light square-top windows at the front facade on 2nd Street (Elevation A); and wood true-divided-light arch-top windows at the remaining facades, Elevations E-L; provided that the rope molding is retained and repaired; with the staff to review details.

242 S. 21ST STREET

Owner: Debi Rochelle

Applicant: Paul Thompson, architect

History: built c. 1855, Contributing to Rittenhouse/Fitler Historic District

Project: Demolish and reconfigure entry stair; add rooftop deck, greenhouse, solar collectors, balconies

OVERVIEW: The application proposes demolishing the original marble stoop to build new wide steps and a basement access to a storage room. For the roof, it proposes a glazed stair enclosure, decks, trellis, and solar collectors. A rear bay would be demolished to allow for new balconies. A sunroom would be added to the side.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial of the alterations to the front stoop for the new steps and basement access; approval of the remainder of the proposal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron explained to the applicants and audience that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. No one objected to proceeding with the review without a quorum.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the members of the Architectural Committee. Architect Paul Thompson and owner Debi Rochelle represented the application.

Mr. Thompson stated that they are presenting the project to the Center City Residents Association.

Mr. Baron explained that, because the roof decks will not be visible and will be located on the rear ell, the staff recommended approval of the roof top work. He reported to the Committee on previous applications denied by the Commission for creation of a well for steps to the basement level. Mr. Thompson explained that his clients needed the stairs because they are converting a five-unit apartment building to condominiums. Currently, the only access to the basement to the utilities and mechanical room is through the first-floor apartment. They wish to create access for all residents. Mr. Thompson stated that, from a financial standpoint, the front basement access makes the most sense; it would prevent the loss of space in the first-floor condominium.

Ms. Rochelle commented that the front steps are deteriorating. She also intends to replace the cracked sidewalk in the future. It was explained that it is possible to reset the existing marble steps to repair them.

Mr. McCoubrey thought that the deck would not be visible and would therefore be acceptable. However, he rejected the alteration to the front stairs, stating that the work does not meet the Standards. Ms. Rochelle stated they had reviewed several options, including a stair in the side alley but could not overcome the problem of headroom. She stated that each unit would have access to its own utilities. Creating an interior stair to

the basement would remove a portion of the first-floor unit. Mr. Thompson asked about the drawbacks of his proposal. Committee members responded that the removal and alteration of original historic fabric particularly on the front façade does not meet the Standards. Examining the plan, Committee members showed how an interior stair could be accommodated from a common stair hall into the basement. The problem results from the developer's attempt to insert four separate units into what was a single family house.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the alterations to the front stoop for the new steps and basement access; approval of the remainder of the proposal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9.

1528 PINE STREET

Owner/Applicant: Michael Caven

History: built 1845, architect, John Havilland

Project: Legalize removal of slate sidewalk and pediment over door

OVERVIEW: This application proposes legalizing the removal of a brownstone pediment above the front door and a portion of bluestone sidewalk in front of the building. The applicant is repairing other areas of masonry on the façade under a separate permit.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron explained to the applicants and audience that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. No one objected to proceeding with the review without a quorum.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the members of the Architectural Committee. Michael Caven, the owner, represented the application.

Mr. Caven explained the deteriorating conditions of the sidewalk and his reasons for replacing it with concrete. He assumed that it was acceptable because several neighbors have concrete sidewalks along Pine Street.

Mr. Caven described the deteriorating pediment over the door as a "blob." He expressed concern for the safety of pedestrians, who were threatened by the blob. He noted that several neighboring houses of the same type had also lost their pediments. He acknowledged that it would be difficult but not impossible to recreate the pediment. Mr. Baron noted that one neighbor in the same row has restored the pediment over his door. He also said that others are restoring their facades. Ms. Pentz opined that not much historic fabric was lost with the removal of the blob, which was greatly deteriorated. Mr. McCoubrey concurred, but also suggested that a new pediment could be cast to restore the doorway. Mr. Baron asked if it was appropriate to remove historic fabric rather than restore it simply because it had deteriorated. Ms. Pentz stated that, in the case of the blob, it was not inappropriate.

Ms. Pentz questioned the applicant on the sidewalk. Mr. Caven stated that the section adjacent to the street was already concrete. Mr. Caven reported that the sidewalks at 1526 and 1528 Pine are concrete, but the sidewalk at 1530 is bluestone. It was noted

Mr. Caven plans to restore the masonry boot-scraper block that was removed without a permit; restore the beltcourse and some bracket detail; and remove the gilding.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend legalization of the removal of the pediment over the door, provided the restoration to the other areas including the molding and capitals is undertaken, but denial of the legalization of the removal of the bluestone sidewalk.

265 S. 19TH STREET

Owner: Premier Fiduciary Properties

Applicant: Lanny Leibowitz, architect

History: c. 1860

Project: Cut door and window, remove stucco

OVERVIEW: This application proposes cutting a doorway at the first floor and a window at the top floor on the Manning Street façade. The cutting a new doorway on the side would change the original residential character of this building.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the window, but denial of the doorway, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron explained to the applicants and audience that the Architectural Committee lacked a quorum. No one objected to proceeding with the review without a quorum.

Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the members of the Architectural Committee. Architect Lanny Leibowitz and owner Joseph DiSanto represented the application.

Messrs. Leibowitz and DiSanto noted the Commission's earlier approval of the removal of the stucco. During the removal, they discovered brick, which they would now like to restore.

Mr. Baron stated this building was constructed as a residential building. Although the first floor had been altered for commercial use, the building retains its original residential character. Inserting a doorway would change the meaning and character of the building. Mr. Leibowitz replied that it is his intent to work with the commercial renovations, altering only the first floor and respecting the upper floors. Mr. Baron replied that he is proposing to cut a window above the proposed doorway in the original portion of the building. Also, cutting a new door opening all the way to ground could destroy the underlying original fabric.

Mr. DiSanto stated that the commercial alterations were undertaken in the late 1950s or early 1960s. The building was altered at the first floor on the 19th Street elevation and part of the Manning Street elevation. Mr. DiSanto also reported that an addition was constructed at the rear many years ago. He added that the commercial changes had been altered over time. He stated that it was his intent to put a door on the side façade, not on the main or 19th Street facade. Mr. DiSanto stated that he planned to use the first floor space for retail and the two upper floors for his private residence. The new side entrance would provide access to the retail space; it would be separate from his private entrance on the front facade. Ms. Pentz asked if the facing at the first floor was cast

stone or stucco. Mr. DiSanto replied that it is painted cast stone. Mr. DiSanto remarked that he seeks only to alter the areas that have already been altered, and to restore the back of the building by removing the stucco and exposing the historic brick.

Ms. Pentz asked about the proposed window. Mr. Leibowitz stated that it would be a new opening that would match and line up with the other windows. Both Ms. Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey deemed the new window opening acceptable. Ms. Pentz questioned the type of door proposed for the retail space. The applicant replied that he would install any door the Committee members would suggest. Mr. McCoubrey stated that this application proposes a traditional neighborhood corner store.

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

ADJOURNMENT: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Section 14-2007(7)(j): No permit shall be issued for the demolition [as defined in Section 14-2007(2)(f)] of ... a building ... located within a historic district which contributes, in the Commission's opinion, to the character of the district, unless the Commission finds that issuance of a permit is necessary in the public interest, or unless the Commission finds that the building ... cannot be used for any purpose which it is or may be reasonably adapted.

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 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.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

Jonathan Farnham, Randal Baron, Jorge Danta, Karen Gonski, Erin McGinn-Cote