

**THE MINUTES OF THE 540TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**10 AUGUST 2007
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18029
MICHAEL SKLAROFF, ESQ., CHAIR**

PRESENT

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Eileen Evans, Department of Licenses & Inspections
John Herzins, Department of Public Property
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Vincent Rivera, AIA
David Schaaf, RA
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing and Community Development

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

ALSO PRESENT

Shaina Horton, Stephen Varenhorst Architects
Matthew Michetti Stephen Varenhorst Architects
Thomas Bernaro, Stephen Varenhorst Architects
Drew Kruetz, Stephen Varenhorst Architects
Dan Neducsin
Stephen Varenhorst, Stephen Varenhorst Architects
Khaled Tarabiea, University of Pennsylvania
David Hollenberg, University of Pennsylvania
Anne Beha, Anne Beha Architects
Philip Chen, Anne Beha Architects
Van Strother, New Covenant Church
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Laura Siena, West Mt. Airy Neighbors
Kevin Smith, Manayunk Neighborhood Council
Eric Poulain
Timothy Calligan, Aegis Property Group
Michelle McAleese, YCH Architects
Jeff Krieger, Krieger Architects
Peggy Conver, Chestnut Hill Academy
Cynthia Padilla, Krieger Architects
Jeffrey M. Laufer, JMLAA
Alyson Herman
Yao-Chang Huang, YCH Architects
Dan Russoniello, Archer & Buchanan Architects
Jonathan Tori

Cynthia Ray
John Kontra
Brett Harmon, Harmon Deutsch Architects
Stephen Pollock, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
Bernie Kapler
Karin Rhodes
Lance Becker
David Orphanides, Esq.
Julie King, Esq.
Martin Rosenberg

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sklaroff, the Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 540th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:05 a.m. Commissioners Brown, Evans, Herzins, Leonard, Merriman, Rivera, Schaaf, Sugrue, and Wilds were in attendance.

MINUTES OF THE 539TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Upon a motion proffered by Mr. Wilds and seconded by Ms. Leonard, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes, as corrected, of the 539th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 13 July 2007.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 24 JULY 2007

Vincent Rivera, Chair

7406 GERMANTOWN AVENUE (AKA 7500 GERMANTOWN AVENUE)

Owner: New Covenant Church

Applicant: Van B. Strother

History: 1890-1892, Wilson Brothers, Wissinoming Hall, Penn. School for the Deaf

Project: Construct five-story exterior elevator tower, create entrance with canopy and trellis, alter fire escape

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a five-story exterior elevator tower, create a new entranceway with canopy and trellis, 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.

The applicant proposed a similar project in August 2006. The staff considered the application incomplete. The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the project as submitted, but to recommend approval of an interior elevator. The applicant withdrew the application before a review by the Commission. The applicant submitted a revised application in January 2007. The Architectural Committee recommended denial pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. The applicant also withdrew the revised application before a review by the Commission. The applicant then submitted an application for an interior elevator, which was approved at the staff

level. The applicant later abandoned the interior scheme when he discovered that it would be very expensive to relocate utilities that stood in the path of the elevator shaft.

Contending that the interior elevator is infeasible, the applicant has now submitted a proposal for a revised exterior elevator tower as well as a new entrance. 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 stone. A glass link would connect the stone tower to the historic building. The tower would be topped with a gable roof, recalling the dormer. A new entranceway would be created adjacent to the elevator tower by cutting down a window. A single-leaf wood door with sidelights is proposed to fill the opening. The rendering erroneously depicts a double-leaf door in the opening. A canopy would be added above the door. A trellis would be added flanking the tower and entranceway. The fire escape would be altered to extend beyond the entranceway. No detailed information has been provided regarding the door, sidelights, trellis or canopy.

The Commission approved a similar but larger elevator tower for an adjacent building on the campus in 2003. The tower is similarly situated at the rear between two wings, but is much closer to the public right-of-way. After the tower was constructed, the Commission received a complaint about the approval from a member of the public who contended that it was a conspicuous and inappropriate addition to the historic building.

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

Mr. Strother displayed renderings of the proposed elevator tower and other modifications. Although the drawings depicted a double-leaf door at the proposed entrance, Mr. Strother explained that he would, in fact, like to install a single-leaf door. He also explained that visibility from the public streets outside the campus would be blocked throughout the year by heavy coniferous vegetation. Mr. Wilds asked if the tower and entrance would be added at a rear parking area. Mr. Strother stated that they would. Mr. Wilds inquired about the use of the upper stories. Mr. Strother explained that the upper floor is difficult to access and is therefore not used. Other areas of the buildings are used for church offices, day-care, and Sunday school. Mr. Wilds asked if the alterations would make the building ADA compliant. He stated that they would.

Mr. Schaaf noted that the Department of Licenses & Inspections may require that the fire escape be rendered code-compliant if it is altered as proposed.

Mr. Sugrue asked the applicant about the proposed cladding for the elevator tower. Mr. Strother replied it would be an applied stone and the intent was to match or compliment the exterior stone material of the historic building. Mr. Strother stated that he would accept the Commission's guidance regarding the exterior cladding of the tower and then submit samples for review.

Mr. Sugrue remarked that the trellis and canopy are incongruous. Mr. Strother stated that the trellis was included to soften the area around the new pedestrian entrance.

Mr. Sklaroff stated this was a campus and the lack of visibility from the outside road was not as significant as the appropriateness of the massing and the design. Mr. Rivera noted that the architect attempted to separate the tower from the building with a glass divider. Mr. Strother

described the glass divider that would connect the tower with the building. Mr. Sklaroff asked the applicant if he would accept an approval of the concept of an elevator tower, covered entrance, and trellis, but present a more detailed application for final review to the Commission. Mr. Strother stated that he would accept an approval in concept.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the proposal in concept including the massing of the tower, shape of the roof, and location of the entrance. Mr. Riviera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1 LEVERINGTON AVENUE

Owner: Venice Island Realty

Philadelphia Management; Lubert-Adler Partners; Neducsin Properties

Applicant: Stephen Varenhorst, AIA

History: large open space with c. 1995 restaurant building
in Main Street Manayunk District

site of mill buildings, which were demolished between 1929 and 1945

Project: Construct residential complex

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct four buildings containing 280 condominium units on a 4.5 acre site on Venice Island, which is situated between the Schuylkill River and the Manayunk Canal. The site runs from the Paul Cret-designed Green Lane Bridge west to Leverington Street. The site is almost entirely vacant. The only structure on it is a unoccupied, non-historic restaurant building, which was erected in the 1990s. This building would be demolished as part of the project.

Major textile manufactories including the Crompton, Wabash, Arcola, and Eagle Mills were located on the site. A densely packed collection of five to seven-story, water-powered, masonry, mill buildings stood along the river and the canal, occupying all of the usable land. The first were erected prior to the Civil War. The mills were expanded throughout the nineteenth and into the early twentieth century. The mills still stood when the stock market crashed in 1929, but had been completely demolished by 1945.

The new condominium buildings would be six stories and 89 feet tall and would stand on columns raising the first floor 19 feet above grade and the flood plain. The architectural style is contemporary. The exterior would be clad in white and brown wood grain panels. Parking is planned on grade beneath and around the raised structures. Each unit would have a private deck as well as access to a common roof deck.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sklaroff recused owing to his firm's relationship with one of the applicants.

Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Commission. Developer Dan Neducsin and architect Stephen Varenhorst represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion.

The applicant displayed a large model of the proposed development. Mr. Varenhorst stated that it would include 280 condominium units in four buildings on 4.5 acres. The buildings would be

raised 19 feet above the site. He noted that the Planning Commission approved the project in June after three months of review. He will seek a zoning variance for height. The buildings are six stories tall; the upper parapet is 89 feet above grade; the lower is 77 feet. The zoning at the site limits the height to 65 feet. He will also seek a variance for exceeding the Floor-to-Area Ratio. He will request a variance for 1.6 times the size of the site. Mr. Varenhorst added that the project has received the requisite environmental approvals. Mr. Sugrue commented that the environmental issues do not fall under the Commission's jurisdiction. Mr. Varenhorst displayed photographs depicting the historic mill buildings and the Green Lane Bridge. He contended that the architectural vocabulary is diverse in the Manayunk Historic District. Mr. Varenhorst described the site, which is bounded by the Green Lane Bridge, railroad bridge, canal, and river. He explained that this site is in an industrial area. He displayed photographs of nearby industrial buildings as well as large, recently-constructed, residential buildings. He stated the vacant, non-historic restaurant building would be demolished as part of this project. Mr. Varenhorst described how the railroad bridge stands about 60 feet above the site. A railroad line also runs along the canal at the northern edge of the property.

Mr. Varenhorst turned his attention from the site to the design. He explained the placement of the buildings, which were sited to allow for views of the canal and the river. He observed that he is proposing to building out toward the canal and river, running the driveways under the buildings; other architects who designed projects for this site gathered their buildings in the center of the island, forcing the paved areas out toward the water. He noted there is only one nearby historic building, the Keely Planing Mill building, which is nestled against the Leverington Street Bridge across the canal from their site.

Mr. Varenhorst remarked that the buildings are relatively tall and slender with elegant proportions. He added that, typically, buildings like these are 65 to 75 feet wide; these are 45 feet wide. He stated that he created large breaks between the buildings as view corridors; they are 35, 40, and 50 feet wide. He stated that the buildings are raised 19 feet above the parking lot. He stated that the sixth floor has half as many units as the other floors to allow for individual and common roof decks. He noted that the foundations will extend 30 feet below grade.

Mr. Varenhorst explained that the cladding would be a wood-grain core panel. This choice of material was in response to the Planning Commission's request to make the project LEED-certified. He stated that the panel is a recycled lightweight product. The applicant noted that the panels would be between 20 and 89 feet off the ground and read as a softened brown color rather than a wood-grain table-top-like material. He explained that the color palette of Manayunk was replete with cream, white, brown brick, and stucco colors. He asserted that the complex would complement the structures in the district. Mr. Varenhorst stated that the fenestration would be dynamic, not static. He is treating the facades like thin screens. The pattern of the windows would be interesting and have a soft reflection in the water. Mr. Varenhorst reported that the unit ceiling heights would be 10 feet. The windows would all be vertical and 8 feet in height. They are akin to mill windows, he claimed.

Mr. Wilds asked if the applicant could reduce the overall height without a loss of units. Mr. Varenhorst stated that the buildings are tall to leave much of the site open. The development would only cover 30 percent of the site, leaving 70 percent open to the sky. Some of the open space would be parking lots, but 40 percent would be landscaped.

Mr. Sugrue asked about the heights of the nearby Venice Lofts buildings. Mr. Varenhorst stated that they are about 60 feet tall. He reiterated that his buildings would be 89 feet tall. Mr. Varenhorst informed the Commission that his client would agree to vary the heights of the

buildings, but would then need to extend some of them above the current 89-foot height. Mr. Schaaf remarked that the railroad bridge, which is very tall, defines Manayunk.

Kevin Smith of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council submitted a letter explaining that the neighborhood group does not support the proposal because it has not had an opportunity to fully discuss it. Mr. Smith asserted that the proposal is significantly flawed. He noted, in particular, that the scale and design of the complex was not appropriate. He stated that it was nothing more than low-cost, high-density housing. He claimed that the buildings would dwarf the Green Lane Bridge, which stands only 25 feet above the island. He claimed that the complex would dominate the view approaching Manayunk. This complex would set a new height standard for Manayunk. Mr. Smith argued that the design is lacking architecturally; it would look like a drab tenement building. He stated that traditional mill buildings were four to five stories or 50 to 60 feet tall. He claimed that this complex bears no resemblance to any building in Manayunk or even Philadelphia. Mr. Smith claimed that much of what the architect represented as open space is not controlled by the developers. Mr. Smith noted that the rail line is still used three to four times a week. He also remarked that, although not within the Commission's purview, the buildings will be constructed from modular units fabricated outside Pennsylvania. Mr. Smith contended that the complex was designed to minimize the participation of the Philadelphia building trades. In closing, Mr. Smith stated that, if it approved this proposal, the Commission would capriciously disregard the Manayunk Ordinance and the history of Manayunk.

Mr. Neducsin contended that Mr. Smith must not be speaking on behalf of the Manayunk Neighborhood Council because his project has never been presented to the Council. Mr. Smith acknowledged that the applicant had not made a formal presentation to the Council, but explained that the Council had reviewed the project based on information garnered at Planning Commission meetings, Zoning Board hearings, and presentations made to the Manayunk Development Corporation. He also noted that the Manayunk Development Corporation had not taken a position on the project and he was not speaking on its behalf.

Mr. Smith displayed a photomontage showing the proposed development from the Green Lane Bridge. Mr. Wilds asserted that Mr. Smith's exhibit distorts the relationship between the bridge and the nearest edge of the development. He explained that, in reality, there would be a substantial gap between the bridge and the nearest edge of the building. Mr. Smith acknowledged that his representation may not be accurate. The buildings are set back approximately 150 feet from the bridge. Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Smith if the Council had supported or opposed other projects on the island. Mr. Smith replied that it had opposed the Dranoff and the Water Mill projects for floodway and safety reasons. Mr. Wilds again asked if the Council had previously opposed development on Venice Island. Mr. Smith observed that it was a legal question he could not answer. Mr. Smith reiterated his position that the Council objected to the current proposal because of the flatness of the design, uniformity of the heights and facades, and the potential for traffic problems. He suggested reducing the height by two floors and the number of units by one half to two thirds.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance highlighted the Architectural Committee's recommendation of denial. He opined that the proposed complex would be inappropriate for this location. He remarked that developers routinely seek to exceed the appropriate scales in historic districts. Mr. Gallery observed that the proposed buildings would be 150 percent taller than is currently allowed by the zoning code. He stated that it would exceed the FAR and the allowable number of units. Mr. Gallery remarked that this would be another example of overbuilding in an historic district. He asked the Commission not to dismiss this proposal as

merely a zoning matter. He suggested that the developer should have presented an in-concept application to the Commission and not deferred his review to the last possible moment. He noted that the Architectural Committee made many valid criticisms. He asked that the Commission consider this proposed complex in its historic context. He opined that this would be an oppressive building. He noted that the application only included a single view from the Manayunk side. The project would totally obscure any views of the river. The uniformity is inappropriate for the historic district, Mr. Gallery claimed. Mr. Gallery urged the Commission to support the Architectural Committee's recommendation. The proposal does not comply with the Secretary of Interior Standards. It is out of character architecturally and its scale and density are inappropriate. He urged the developer to rethink the design.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Farnham to elaborate on the staff recommendation. Mr. Farnham noted that the staff had undertaken considerable research to understand the context. He referred the Commissioners to a package of materials including maps and renderings of the old mills. He stated that the historic industrial buildings that once stood on and around this site were very different from the commercial and residential buildings on Main Street. The historic buildings on Venice Island were large, tall, densely packed, and irregularly arranged. Mr. Farnham stated that, although this proposal would not replicate the old mill buildings, it would create a contemporary development with a layout and massing that echoed the historic buildings. He acknowledged that it would block the view of the Schuylkill from Main Street, but noted that the historic mill buildings had also blocked the very same view. Mr. Farnham reported that the staff had not considered traffic, parking spaces, and other planning and zoning issues when it formulated its recommendation. The staff concluded that, although contemporary in style, the proposed complex would be compatible, as required by the Manayunk Ordinance, with the historic buildings and structures stand or once stood on and around the site. Mr. Gallery disagreed. He claimed that there are no buildings in Manayunk taller than 55 or 60 feet. He also noted that the cladding materials are not compatible. He concluded that the proposal does not comply with the Manayunk Ordinance.

Mr. Baron informed the Commission that Daniela Voith of the Architectural Committee, who had vigorously opposed this project during the Committee's review, had contacted the staff to clarify her position. She stated that, although she still advocated for height reductions and greater variety, she now supported the project.

Mr. Schaaf stated that the river is not visible from most points in Manayunk. Mr. Sugrue agreed.

ACTION: By a vote of 6 to 2, the Commission adopted the motion proffered by Messrs. Schaaf and Wilds to approve the application as submitted. Messrs. Herzins and Rivera dissented. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

2321 MADISON SQUARE

Owner/Applicant: Eric Poulain

History: c. 1855; mansard, late 19th century; penthouse, 20th century

Project: Add rooftop deck

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

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for adding a deck on top of the mansard roof of this rowhouse. The applicant would use the existing penthouse for access. The deck would be visible from the

public right-of-way. A similar deck was denied by the Commission within the last year for the building across the street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner Eric Poulain represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the Architectural Committee had suggested that the staff review a mock-up of the deck at the site. Mr. Baron stated that he had scheduled a meeting with the applicant to review the mock-up prior to the Commission meeting, but the applicant had later cancelled that meeting. Mr. Baron also noted the applicant's letter to the Commission members.

Mr. Wilds recalled that the Commission had reviewed and denied a deck set back from the front façade for a reconstructed building across the street.

Mr. Poulain described his property including its unique mansard with penthouse, which extend about 8 feet onto the neighboring property to the west. He explained that two brothers owned the properties in the late 1800s; one granted an easement to the other to build onto his property. He described the stairs in the penthouse, which lead to a door onto the roof. To get to the room in the penthouse, one must exit the door at the top of the stairs and walk out onto the roof and then in a second door to the room. Mr. Wilds asked about the inappropriate siding on the penthouse. Mr. Poulain replied that the siding was in place on the penthouse when he purchased the property 20 years ago. Mr. Wilds stated that the siding looked less than 20 years old.

Mr. Wilds asked if it would be possible to modify the stair or penthouse to get to the room without going out onto the roof. Mr. Poulain stated that he had considered modifying the penthouse for interior access, but such a modification was found to be infeasible. When asked about the size of the room, Mr. Poulain responded that it is about 160 square feet. Mr. Wilds asked about the door and window in the penthouse, which look new. The applicant stated that he installed the window in the 1990s and the door recently. The old door had been leaking. He conceded that this work was done without permits. Mr. Sugrue suggested that he legalize the work done without permits or approvals. Mr. Wilds suggested that the applicant work with the staff to find a more appropriate siding for the penthouse. Mr. Sklaroff stated that, regardless of the cladding, this "crown on a crown" is an unfortunate anomaly.

Mr. Poulain stated that, without a railing, accessing the penthouse room is unsafe. He stated that he has had difficulty obtaining insurance owing to the unsafe condition. He is, however, currently insured.

Regarding the public visibility of the proposed deck, Mr. Sugrue concluded that it would be visible from the street. He noted that the Commission has routinely denied decks like this owing to their visibility. Mr. Sklaroff stated that he generally opposed roof decks like this one, but he noted that the safety issue adds another dimension to this question. Mr. Sklaroff stated that an approval of this deck would set a negative precedent for the block.

Ms. Merriman suggested that the applicant reconsider altering the penthouse for internal access to the room.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance supported the Architectural Committee's recommendation of denial. He stated his office has worked over the past year with the residents of the block to restore the gardens and fences. He stated that the block should be protected for

inappropriate alterations. Regarding the safety concern, he suggested that the applicant not use the penthouse room if it is unsafe to access it. Mr. Gallery strongly urged the Commission to deny the submission.

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

12-16 LETITIA STREET

Applicant: Rustin Ohler

Owner: John Kontra

History: c. 1885, individually designated 1976, contributing to Old City District

Project: Legalize deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the deck, provided the wood railing is replaced with a metal railing, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guideline.

OVERVIEW: This project involves legalizing a rooftop deck for an industrial building with no rear ell. A deck existed previously in this location, but burned in a recent fire. The owner replaced it without a permit. The deck railing, although pulled back from the façade will be minimally visible from 2nd Street. A metal railing would be less visible than the current wood railing.

DISCUSSION: The Commission agreed to hear this application out of order. Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. Architect Brett Harman and John Kontra, the president of the condominium association, represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the Commission had approved a roof deck for this location in 1983; however, the railing approved at that time was not specified or depicted on the plan.

Mr. Harman stated that he and his client do not agree with the recommendation. Mr. Kontra stated that a fire had destroyed the earlier roof deck. It was replaced with an identical deck; however, the work was undertaken without a permit. He stated that, although the Architectural Committee recommended changing the rail to a metal rail, he preferred to keep the wooden rail. He explained that his association plans to install a fire suppression unit on the deck. He said that they could afford to change the deck rail or install the system, but not both.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the deck, provided the wood railing is replaced with a metal railing, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guideline. Mr. Sugrue seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 7 to 2. Messrs. Sklaroff and Schaaf dissented.

201 S. 34TH STREET, MUSIC BUILDING

Owner: University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Richard Russell

History: 1890, Cope & Stewardson, architects; additions 1966 & 1967

Project: In Concept: demolition of additions and rear ell, construction of three-story addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, provided the addition connects to the main block below the projecting eave, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes the demolition of additions and a rear ell and the construction of three-story addition to this historic building. The firm of Cope & Stewardson designed the building for the Foulke Long Institute, an orphanage for daughters of fallen firefighters and Civil War soldiers. The University of Pennsylvania converted it for use as a science building in the early twentieth century. It later converted it to house the music department.

The applicants have studied two major avenues to expand and improve the facilities for the music department. Both would involve the demolition of the c. 1960s accretions and the restoration of the main block of the building. One path would retain the rear ell and add to it; the other would demolish the rear ell and add onto the east side of the main building.

The applicants are applying for approval in concept for this second path. They have studied the plans for the building and believe that the rear ell was either significantly altered from the original Cope & Stewardson plan or not built according to the plans on record. In either case, the wing was used to house the kitchen, pantry and support functions of the orphanage. They propose its demolition because it will improve the function of the new building in terms of acoustics, size of spaces for recording and performance, and for campus space planning. Currently the east side reads as a rear service area. The new plan would allow the creation of a green on the south side and the development of a primary façade on the campus walkway. The option that retains the rear ell would block westward views of the main building. The design of the addition in place of the ell would respect the massing, materials and rhythms of the main building.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Commission. University Architect David Hollenberg and architect Anne Beha, the principal of Anne Beha Architects of Boston, represented the application.

Mr. Baron stated that the staff and Architectural Committee agreed that the removal of the rear ell would not constitute a demolition as defined in the ordinance.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Baron to clarify the dates and locations of the wings and additions to the original building. Mr. Baron stated that the original Cope & Stewardson plans show a very small ell, but not the one that exists today. The current ell dates to about 1912. Using photographs, Mr. Baron identified the 1912 ell and the later additions.

MOTION: Mr. Riviera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application in concept, provided the addition connects to the main block below the projecting eave, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion.

Mr. Hollenberg explained that the University is in the early stages of planning an expansion of the Music Building. The goal is to add space and improve the acoustics to better house the music program. He stated that the University has been considering two alternatives, one that would retain the ell and one that would remove it. After more than one year of study, the University and its consultant have concluded that the alternative that includes removing the ell is better. Therefore, the University is now seeking an in-concept approval for the alternative that includes removing the ell. Before the project can progress, the University must know whether the Commission will approve the removal of the ell. He stated that the project would also be presented to the Commission at a later date for a final review.

Ms. Beha described the context around the Music Building. She noted that the context had changed significantly since the buildings were used as an orphanage. During the second decade of the twentieth century, the University developed a science and engineering campus adjacent to this site, adding large institutional buildings next to the domestically scaled buildings. She explained that the rear ell on the Music Building was either not constructed according to the original plans or significantly altered by 1912, when it was converted for use as a physics building by the University. She stated that the original ell housed a laundry and kitchen area on the first floor and a small bathroom on the second. She stated that the enlarged ell was not well planned; its structural system is unusual. She noted the difficulties that would be faced if the rear ell was retained. The low ceiling heights make the ell difficult to incorporate into a new building. If anything is built adjacent to the ell, the ell will need to be underpinned and the north wall will need to be entirely rebuilt. Ms. Beha also stated that the main block of the Music Building would be restored.

Ms. Beha described Scheme A, which would retain the ell. She stated that this scheme does not provide enough space and much of the space it does provide would be in the basement. She stated that there are drainage problems in the area and basement space is not desirable. If the ell is retained, then the new addition would be forced to protrude into the walkway space to the north of the building. Also, the foundations would require underpinning and the structure of the ell reinforcing. The basement would need to be excavated. She displayed boards showing the scheme with the ell retained. She stated that the first floor would be five feet above grade in this scheme, necessitating the use of very long ramps to achieve ADA compliance. She also stated that retaining the ell would require limiting the height of the addition to the eave line of the ell owing to drainage problems. Mr. Wilds suggested that the drainage problem could be solved. Ms. Beha replied that the drainage problem was only one of many technical problems presented by the retention of the ell.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Hollenberg to clarify for the Commission the extent of the in-concept approval he is seeking. Mr. Hollenberg explained to the Commission that the critical question today is whether the Commission would allow the removal of the ell. The answer to this question will determine which scheme the design team pursues. Mr. Sklaroff asked if he was seeking approval of the massing of the addition. Mr. Hollenberg stated that he was not. Mr. Wilds stated that an approval in concept of the demolition of the ell would imply an approval of some new construction.

Mr. Wilds stated that he considered Smith Walk and the views of the ell from it of more importance than the alley to the north. Ms. Beha countered that the majority of the music-related foot traffic occurs between the Music Building and the building to the north, across this alley. Mr. Wilds asked her to consider the change to the view from Smith Walk. Ms. Beha stated she sought to restore the green space along Smith Walk, which has been lost.

Ms. Beha displayed images of Scheme B, without the ell. She stated that Scheme B was more successful architecturally. She stated that the square footage of the ell is approximately 7% of the total site. She reiterated that the site and context have changed significantly. She noted that the removal of the ell would allow her to meet the Music Department's programmatic goals.

Mr. Wilds reminded the Commission of the agreement between the University, Commission, and Pennsylvania Museum & Historical Commission regarding the demolition of Smith Hall that stipulated that new construction behind Music and Morgan would be reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). He asked Mr. Hollenberg if the SHPO had reviewed these plans. Mr. Hollenberg stated that he presented the plans to the Commission first, but would present them to the SHPO following this review. Mr. Wilds stated that he would prefer to see the ell retained. Mr. Hollenberg and Ms. Beha restated their reasons for removing the ell. Mr. Hollenberg also noted that his team rejected all proposals for an addition that would be taller than the main block. Mr. Schaaf asked if the ell could be used as is for any music functions. Ms. Beha stated that it cannot be left as is under any circumstances because the structure must be entirely replaced to meet the building code.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that the ell is historic whether it is original or only 100 years old. He noted that the University had decided to retain the ell when constructing an addition in the 1960s. He contended that Ms. Beha's predecessors considered the ell as an integral part of the history of the old structure that should be retained. He suggested that the ell should be retained. He commended the applicants for appearing before the Commission at an early point in the design process. He asserted that this would be a demolition, not an alteration. He stated that, even if this does not meet the legal definition of a demolition, the spirit of the ordinance suggests that historic fabric should be preserved whenever possible. He contended that the University was making an implicit financial hardship argument for the demolition when it noted the underpinning and other difficulties the retention would create. He stated that the University should present a real hardship application if it is going to make a hardship argument. He then contended that the University was also making an aesthetic argument. He stated that the ell should be retained, even if it makes the new design more difficult. He remarked that the ell has a richness and scale that would be lost with the proposed addition, which is a large, simple block. He urged the University and its architect to preserve the ell and explore Scheme A further.

Mr. Hollenberg reiterated the reasons for removing the ell. The reasons are technical, programmatic, and related to landscape and pedestrian use. Ms. Beha showed preliminary renderings of the proposed addition. It would clad in terra cotta with a glass connector to the old building. Mr. Gallery stated that Ms. Beha's design without the ell has "no character." He stated that the plan that retained the ell had character.

Mr. Sklaroff clarified that the motion under discussion proposes to approve the application in concept, provided the addition connects to the main block below the projecting eave, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. The motion, he noted, implicitly includes the approval of the concept of demolishing the rear ell.

ACTION: By a vote of 5 to 2, the Commission adopted the motion proffered by Messrs. Riviera and Schaaf to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application in concept, provided the addition connects to the main block below the projecting eave, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Ms. Merriman and Mr. Wilds dissented. Mr. Sklaroff abstained. Mr. Sugrue recused.

500 W. WILLOW GROVE AVENUE, CHESTNUT HILL ACADEMY

Owner: Chestnut Hill Academy

Applicant: Cynthia Padilla

History: Wissahickon Inn, 1882-84, Hewitt Brothers, architects

Commons Building, 1905, Frank Miles Day, architect

Project: Construct detached Science Building with related site improvements

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a new science building at Chestnut Hill Academy. A previous scheme, which was not presented to the Commission, proposed a larger building that was linked to the historic inn building. The current application proposes a free standing building that is respectful of its surrounding historic neighbors without being historicist. The proposed site of the new science building is currently a parking lot. The lot would be relocated to a spot closer to Willow Grove Avenue. The new parking lot would be landscaped with a green buffer to diminish its visibility from the avenue. The entire project is predicated on an environmental philosophy. The site is part of the Wissahickon watershed and the science building as well as the parking lot will incorporate water management strategies to maintain the important environmental balance of this site.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sklaroff recused and passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue because a partner sits on the board of Chestnut Hill Academy.

Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Peggy Conner, the school's business manager, Timothy Calligan, the project manager, and architect Jeff Krieger represented the application.

Mr. Krieger presented a comprehensive overview of the proposal. Mr. Wilds noted that the overall campus plan has been studied in great depth recently. He contended that this proposal benefited from that earlier study.

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

1714 PINE STREET

Owner: Alyson & Stephen Herman

Applicant: Betty Mon

History: c. 1845, part of a row; rear alterations c. 1900.

Project: Legalize third-floor addition, replace windows

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application as submitted, pursuant to Standards 4 and 9, but approval of enclosing the porch, provided the columns and rafter tails remain outside the new facades and exposed, with the staff to review details

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a third-floor addition at the rear of the property. The property underwent major alterations around 1900, which included the addition of metal bays, leaded glass windows, and a third-floor porch. Designation photographs as well as aerial photography from 2004 reveal the rear porch in place. The porch has since been enclosed and

windows added. The elevations submitted propose replacement of windows throughout the back as well as the front façade. However, no details have been provided for the replacement windows.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sklaroff recused and passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue because his firm represents the property owner. Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Owner Alyson Herman, contractor Bernie Kapler, architect Yao-Chang Huang, and attorney Stephen Pollock represented the application.

Mr. Wilds inquired as to the visibility of this alteration. Mr. Danta explained it is visible along Waverly Street, a narrow service street. Mr. Pollock stated that, although it is visible from Waverly, it is not visible from 17th Street owing to an ivy-covered party wall. He showed photographs of other rear alterations along that block. He stated that his client purchased the property in 2005 in this condition.

Mr. Sugrue asked about the circumstances of the enclosure of the porch. Mr. Pollack stated that the previous owner had enclosed the porch without a permit. He stated that his client, the current owner, became aware of the illegal enclosure while applying for a permit for interior work. He noted that she may also need to cut down two windows into doors at the rear. Mr. Wilds asked about the columns, which the Architectural Committee recommended should be revealed. Mr. Baron stated that he had been told that the columns did survive within the new room. He also noted that the current owner had stuccoed the newly-enclosed porch. Ms. Herman stated that the porch was enclosed when she purchased the property; she only patched the stucco. Mr. Pollack stated that the contractor, Mr. Kapler, could speak to the matter of the columns. Mr. Wilds asked if the owner would replace the missing cornice. Mr. Pollock proposed to recreate the missing cornice on the side of the ell with one of the same profile, but in wood instead of metal. Ms. Herman stated that the cornice would be an exact match for the historic profile. Mr. Pollack stated that the owner would also replace a missing grill. Mr. Pollack also stated that his client would install the appropriate 6-over-6 windows. Mr. Wilds asked if the columns had survived within the enclosed room. Mr. Kapler stated that the columns were removed by the previous owner. He stated that the ghosts from the columns can still be seen, but the columns themselves are gone. Ms. Herman stated that “the whole building is a disaster.”

Mr. Danta stated for the record that he had explained to the applicant during a site visit that the staff could only approve wood, true-divided-light windows. He stated that the applicant had included window replacement in the application without specifying whether the replacement units were wood, vinyl, or clad. Mr. Wilds commented that, if the applicant proposes anything other than the type of window the staff can approve, then the applicant must appear before the Commission to seek an approval.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to legalize the enclosure of the third floor as constructed, provided the missing cornice is replicated, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3504 HAMILTON STREET

Owner: Lance Becker & Karin Rhodes

Applicant: Victor Brubaker

History: c. 1865; designated 3/31/1964

Project: Construct rear addition with deck; install decorative window grills in front façade

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee noted for the record that the second-floor, west window infill had been withdrawn and voted to recommend approval of the remainder of the proposal, provided the window grilles are simplified, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a one-story rear addition with a deck on the west side of the rear ell. This would involve demolishing the first-floor west wall of the rear ell and erecting a 10-foot by 13-foot sunroom in its place. The deck would be accessed by a cut-down window from the second-story bay. The alterations proposed for the south elevation of the main block have been approved at the staff level as it is a secondary façade and not visible from the public right-of-way. Alterations are also proposed for the one-story addition beyond the rear ell, which include a new door and infilling window openings at the rear. A door on the east side of the building is proposed for infill. A window on the west wall of the main block was initially proposed for infill, but this portion of the application has been withdrawn. This application also proposes to install decorative window grills in the front façade.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Karin Rhodes and Lance Becker, the property owners, represented the application.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the revised application, provided the window grilles are simplified, with the staff to review details. Mr. Riviera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

2417 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: Jonathan M. Tori

Applicant: Jonathan M. Tori

History: Contributing to the Rittenhouse/Fitler District, 2/8/1995

Project: Exterior alteration to rear façade; construct second-floor deck

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the rear wall and roof of a one-story non-historic rear shed addition. Wood slider doors and sidelights and stucco are proposed for the rear wall of the addition. The roof would be squared off and a deck added. Access to the deck would be provided by cutting down a bay window. This application also proposes to add a door, by cutting down a window, at the rear of the main block, which would not be visible from Manning Street. New parking pavers are proposed for the rear yard, as well as, a new fence with a double-door gate off Manning Street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Property owner Jonathan Tori and his sister Cynthia Ray represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked if Mr. Tori planned to use the rear for parking. Mr. Tori stated that he did not.

MOTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3509 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: 35th & Spring Garden Partners, LLP

Applicant: Jeff M. Laufer AIA

History: house, c. 1865; stable, c. 1890; designated 4/30/1963

Project: In concept - expand parking area, construct addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided an arborist or landscape architect consults on the preservation of the trees, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This property is comprised of three buildings: the c. 1865 Italianate house with a large side yard, the c. 1890 stable/service building, and the 1959 school building. The house with yard and stable are individually listed on the Register; the school building, which has its own address, is not designated. The plans indicate additions to the school building; however, it is not under the Commission's jurisdiction. This application seeks an in-concept approval to expand the parking area in the open space on the lot. The applicant intends to use Turfstone where possible to maintain a green space and to retain a number of the mature trees on the lot.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Steven Atlas, the property owner, and Jeff Lauffer, the architect, represented the application.

Mr. Lauffer stated that he requested an in-concept review owing to a lack of details; however, he has since provided the details and would like to be granted a final approval. Mr. Lauffer clarified that the paving material would be Turfstone. Mr. Lauffer presented a report from a landscape architect specifying a method to ensure the protection of the trees. Mr. Sugrue suggested that the staff assess through the report. Mr. Schaaf noted that one tree would be removed. Mr. Lauffer acknowledged that it would. He stated that the Committee was aware of its removal and factored it into its recommendation of approval. Mr. Reuter noted that the application was advertised as an in-concept application, but the Commission was now contemplating final approval. Mr. Sklaroff stated that granting final approval of the application is within the Commission's discretion.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to grant final approval to the application. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

1919 WALNUT STREET

Owner: Imaging Properties of Philadelphia, LP

Applicant: Jeffrey C. Heaton

History: c. 1870; contributing to Rittenhouse-Fitler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Legalize front steps, sidewalk and planters

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the demolition of brownstone steps and non-historic pavement and the subsequent construction of brick steps, brick pavement and planters. The applicant received a violation, which was appealed directly to the Board of License & Inspection Review. The Board scheduled a hearing for the appeal twice. The appeal was continued both times. At its last hearing the Board advised the applicant to submit an application to the Historical Commission. On the appeal form, the applicant states that the demolished steps were brick and cement rather than brownstone and that the work was carried out as an "emergency basis" and that the owner was not aware of any historical requirements. The applicant stated at the Board of Licenses & Inspections Review hearing that the new steps were constructed within the existing foot-print and at the same height. However, the Historical Commission files contain photographs that show that the new steps are taller and extend beyond the footprint of the previous steps. In addition, the applicant also stated that the planters on the sidewalk were an existing condition. These planters however, do not appear in any of the designation photos and furthermore the City of Philadelphia's official aerial photography records show that as of 2003 the sidewalk did not have planters. Lastly the herringbone brick paving was also installed at the same time as the steps. This paving material is not historic nor is it appropriate for this location.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Attorneys David Orphanides and Julie King and property owner Martin Rosenberg represented the application.

Mr. Orphanides detailed the sequence of events that led to the construction of new steps. He stated that Mr. Rosenberg purchased the building for his medical imaging business. Because the steps were in disrepair, Mr. Rosenberg decided to replace them to protect his clients and employees. Mr. Orphanides stated that, "apparently," one of Mr. Rosenberg's employees inquired at the Department of Licenses & Inspections about whether a permit would be required to replace the steps. Mr. Rosenberg stated that Jeff Heat, who was his general counsel at the time, was advised by the Department of Licenses & Inspections that a permit was not required to replace the steps. Mr. Rosenberg reported that Mr. Heat testified about his visit to the Department at the Board of License & Inspection Review hearing. Mr. Rosenberg explained that he and Mr. Heat have been unable to identify the clerk Mr. Heat spoke to at the Department. He also stated that the new steps are exactly the same as the old steps. He asserted that they did not change the size, location, or any other aspect of the steps. Mr. Wilds held up photographs and stated that the new and old are very different. Mr. Rosenberg stated that the only difference is that the bottom step is curved. Mr. Wilds pointed out that the new steps are brick; the old were not. Mr. Rosenberg conceded that there was a change in materials. Mr. Wilds asked applicants if, in their view, the steps pictured in the photographs before and after the replacement are identical. They did not answer the question. Mr. Orphanides instead claimed that the steps at the time of the replacement were not those pictured in Mr. Wilds' "before" photograph, but were brick and concrete. He noted that the steps may have been brownstone at one time. Mr. Wilds stated that the steps may have been brick, but the brick was not visible; it

was covered with another material. Mr. Sugrue stated that the new steps have treads that look like bluestone; the older steps did not have treads with this appearance. Mr. Danta explained that he had compiled a series of photographs of the steps that include the 1995 designation photographs. Mr. Orphanides showed a photograph to Mr. Rosenberg and asked him if it depicted the replacement steps he had installed. Mr. Rosenberg first stated that it did not depict the current steps, but then, on closer inspection, agreed that it did. Mr. Orphanides asked Mr. Rosenberg if the steps depicted in the designation photograph were in place when he bought the building. Mr. Rosenberg stated that they were not extant when he bought the building. Mr. Orphanides asked Mr. Rosenberg when he bought the building. Mr. Rosenberg first replied 6 years ago, but then corrected himself, stating that it was 5 or 7 years ago.

Mr. Wilds asked Mr. Rosenberg about the planters. He answered that the planters were in place when he purchased the property, but were cement. Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Rosenberg when he bought the building. Mr. Rosenberg stated that he bought it 5 years ago. Mr. Sugrue noted that an aerial photograph from 2003, one year after the apparent purchase date, does not depict any planters. Mr. Rosenberg stated that he believes that he purchased the building 5 years ago and that the steps were brick and concrete and the planters were extant. Mr. Orphanides stated that his client constructed the new steps out of brick and slate. He added that he purchased 200-year-old brick to match the brick on the upper floors of the building. He noted that the building is brick and brownstone. Mr. Orphanides stated that the steps were constructed in "what appears to be the same footprint" as the old steps. He stated that the door was not raised, but is in its original location. He noted that the steps comply with the building code requirements for the dimensions of treads and risers. He stated that the cement planters were replaced with new brick planters. He stated that his client has no photographs of the site before the work was undertaken. Mr. Orphanides reported that his client was issued a permit by the Streets Department to close the sidewalk during the work. It was closed for six weeks.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Ms. Evans of the Department of Licenses & Inspections if a building permit is required "to repave" the sidewalk. She replied that a building permit is not necessary; however, a Streets Department permit is necessary. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Orphanides if his client obtained a Street Department permit to replace the concrete sidewalk with brick. He stated that his client "did not go to the Streets Department and secure, as far as I know, any type of permits from the Streets Department because they didn't know that they had to." Mr. Sklaroff pointed out that the applicant did not have the requisite approvals from the Historical Commission, Department of Licenses & Inspections, or Streets Department. Mr. Rosenberg stated that his employee was told by the clerk at the Department of Licenses & Inspections that he did not need a permit for the concrete sidewalk at the same time that he was told that he did not need a permit for the reconstruction of the steps. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the possibility that wrong information was provided by an unidentified person at the Department of Licenses & Inspections, especially when the questions posed to that person are unknown, should have no effect on the outcome of this review. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the owner of the property is ultimately responsible for knowing the law and acquiring all requisite permits. Mr. Rosenberg stated that Griggs & Barrone was the contractor. He stated that he paid \$13,300 for materials and more than \$14,850 for labor. Mr. Rosenberg also stated that the applicant was licensed and union. Mr. Sklaroff suggested the applicant may have recourse with the contractor. Mr. Sklaroff also noted that the applicant has no letter or memorandum from the Department of Licenses & Inspections evidencing his claims about the need for a building permit.

Mr. Orphanides reported on the variety of non-historic and inappropriate materials and designs of steps along the adjacent blocks of Walnut Street. He contended that many of the steps are not in compliance with City agencies. Mr. Sklaroff disagreed and stated that it is possible that every one of the sets of steps cited by Mr. Orphanides is in compliance. He stated that Mr. Orphanides' contentions about the varying steps "does not tell us anything." Mr. Orphanides conceded that his client had not obtained the proper permits, but requested that the Commission legalize the steps in light of the disparate step types in the area and the quality of the work on his client's steps. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the applicant should have applied to the Commission prior to any construction. If he had done so, the Commission would have known the facts, including whether the planters were extant; it would have been able to advise on the appropriateness of the brick sidewalk, railing, and materials of the steps; and it would have been able to take all of these factors into account before rendering a decision. Mr. Wilds asked if the applicant is requesting legalization without any alterations to restore the steps to their original appearance. Mr. Orphanides stated that that is his request, but he would consider proposals from the Commission.

Mr. Wilds asked if the applicant was asserting that all three planters existed before they undertook the work. Mr. Orphanides stated that something was there in all three cases prior to the work commencing. He explained that they are now electrified; they were not electrified before. Mr. Wilds asked if an electrical permit had been obtained. Mr. Orphanides and Mr. Rosenberg stated that they did not know. Mr. Wilds asked if the applicant has considered retaining the new base of the steps, removing the slate, and refacing it to look like the original steps. Mr. Orphanides stated that his client would consider the proposal. Mr. Wilds concluded that the applicant has made no effort to explore altering the new steps to look like the original steps. Mr. Rivera noted that the planters require the approval of the Streets Department. Mr. Orphanides noted that they may need the approval of City Council, in the form of an ordinance, as well. Mr. Reuter noted that permits would have been required for the steps because they project into the public right-of-way regardless of historic status. Ms. Evans agreed and stated that it is important to know precisely what question was posed to the Department of Licenses & Inspections. "Can I replace my stairs?" is very different from "Do I need a building permit to replace my stairs at a certain address that is designated as historic?" Mr. Sklaroff agreed and stated that the question and answer are only relevant if placed in writing. Mr. Reuter also raised the question of ADA requirements. Mr. Baron noted that the Art Commission also has jurisdiction over the planters.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the legalization, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 12:45 p.m., Ms. Merriman moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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

Standard 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.