

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

**19 DECEMBER 2006
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
VINCENT RIVERA, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Rudy D'Alessandro
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA

Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

ALSO PRESENT

Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Peter Hynes, Society Hill Civic Association
Lawrence Mason, Michael Ryan Architects
Judy Pote
Carolyn Wahrneberger
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Robert Powers, Powers & Company
Frans A. Van Wagenberg, Lorraine, LP
Cheryl Smith, Cope Linder Architects
Carl Doebley, DPK&A
Michael Nardella, Cope Linder Architects
Logan Smith, Powers & Company
Darwin Beauvais, Klehr Harrison
Alec Waddell, Acorn Properties
Kevin Rasussen
Steve Shapiro, Acorn Properties
Paul Drzal, Harman Deutsch
Brett Harman Harman Deutsch
Van Strother, New Covenant Church
Len Nardone, Lichtenstein Consulting
Laura Siena, West Mt. Airy Neighbors
Phillip W. Cuffey, 1322 Pine St. LLC
Bill Caden, SEPTA
Tom Holloman, TMH Architects

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Ms. Pentz, and Messrs. D'Alessandro and Levy joined him on the Committee.

531-535 DELANCEY STREET

Owner: Harold and Judy Pote

Applicant: Liz Pisano, Pisano Enterprise

History: 531 – c.1800, demolished sometime between 1867 and 1960, circa 1963 became a garden space.

533 – c. 1800 with 1960s alterations

535 – c. 1802 with 1960s alterations

Individually listed, 531 is contributing, 533 and 535 are significant

Project: Create off-street parking for one vehicle.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to create a one-car parking pad with stone pavers, reconstruct one brick pier, replace the current iron gate with a new gate with wood slats, install a wood frame trellis over new carport, and replace the existing curb with a sloped stone matching existing stone material. The new driveway would be constructed in an open area currently used as a garden with walkway. At house once stood at 531 Delancey, the location of the open space; it was erected about 1800 and demolished at some point between 1867 and 1960. In 1963, during the redevelopment period in Society Hill, houses 533 and 535 Delancey were rehabilitated and the vacant lot at 531 was converted into a garden.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. Owner Judy Pote and architect Lawrence Mason represented the application.

Mr. Levy asked why the new automobile gate would not match the existing pedestrian seen in the photograph. Ms. Pote explained that the pedestrian gate stands on an adjacent property, not her property. Ms. Pote stated that she desires a solid gate to hide the vehicle parked behind it, giving the impression of a gate to a garden space. Mr. McCoubrey asked the architect to explain his gate design. He stated that the wood would be mahogany or cedar. The wood section of the gate would be set into, not applied on top of, the metal frame. Mr. Mason said that the wood will weather to a gray color. Mr. McCoubrey suggested an all-wood gate as opposed to the proposed hybrid wood and metal gate. Mr. Mason replied that the span is wide enough to require the strength of the metal.

Mr. McCoubrey solicited comments from the audience. Carolyn Wahrenberger, a resident of the neighborhood, stated that the neighbors and the Society Hill Civic Association oppose the proposal. Ms. Pote responded that the Society Hill Civic Association has not opposed the proposal. Ms. Wahrenberger questioned why the Committee might recommend approval of a driveway even though there are no others on this block of Delancey Street. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the proposal would have no impact on historic resources; he noted that Ms. Wahrenberger should direct questions about the curb cut to the Streets Department.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

Mr. Thomas arrived to join the Committee.

699 N. BROAD STREET (LORRAINE HOTEL)

Owner: NSI Venturi Fund Five-DL LP, Patrick J. O'Neil, principal; Sunergy Housing Divine Lorraine LLC, Benno Wiersma, principal.

Applicant: Michael F. Treacy

History: 1892-93, Willis Hale, architect. Designated 13 May 2005

Project: IN CONCEPT REVIEW, rehabilitate Lorraine Hotel building, demolish rear annex, and construct rear addition.

OVERVIEW: This application in concept proposes to rehabilitate the historic Lorraine Hotel for residential and commercial use, demolish the annex, and construct a connecting mix-use complex in two phases. The in-concept application raises two fundamental questions that must be answered before the review of the new construction can proceed.

First, it proposes the demolition of the annex, a separate structure at the rear of the hotel. The annex was designated as part of the hotel, which was individually certified in 2005. If the Commission deems that the removal of this structure constitutes a *Demolition* as defined in §14-2007(2)(f), then that demolition can be approved only after the Commission has determined that it would financially infeasible to retain the annex or in the public interest to demolish it. If the Commission deems that the removal of this structure does not constitute a *Demolition*, then it may review the proposal as an *Alteration*.

Second, the Commission must determine the extent of its jurisdiction over the new construction. The proposed complex would connect to the designated hotel building and encroach on the designated parcel, but would also extend across five undesignated parcels. Portions of the new complex would physically and visually impact the historic building; others would have no direct impact on it.

The application proposes to convert the Lorraine Hotel into approximately 150 condominium units. The conversion would include two commercial spaces at the ground floor facing North Broad Street. This would involve the construction of a terrace along the east façade of the hotel. Other alterations to the façade would include the removal of fire-escape systems and modifications to the balcony railings to make them code compliant. Other proposed work includes masonry and window restoration.

The new buildings would be constructed in two phases. Phase One would include the rehabilitation of the historic hotel, demolition of the annex, and construction of a mix-use complex. This new complex would have approximately 450 condominium units, 55,000-square-foot supermarket and enclosed garage. Phase Two would include another residential complex and garage.

The applicant has submitted location and massing studies of the proposed new construction. These studies show that the new construction would be contemporary in style and no taller than the historic Lorraine Hotel. The new construction would connect to the Lorraine Hotel at the ground floor approximately where the annex currently stands. The proposed Phase-One residential complex would stand away from the historic building with buffer zone between the new and old. This buffer zone would afford unobstructed views of the Hotel's facades and would preserve its visual prominence at the intersection of North Broad Street and Ridge Avenue.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to the demolition of the rear annex, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10 and §14-2007(7)(j).

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the in-concept application to the Committee. Preservation consultant Robert Powers, restoration architect Carl Doebley, architects Michael Nardella and Carol Smith, and developers Frans Van Wagenberg and Michael Treacy represented the application.

Mr. Baron informed the Committee that the applicants had not presented any claim of financial hardship or public interest to justify the demolition.

Mr. Thomas asked about the lack of restoration details in the application. Mr. Powers explained that a detailed restoration plan for the hotel building would be presented at a later date. He also noted that several developers have proposed plans for the adaptive reuse of this important building, but none have brought those plans to fruition. Mr. Treacy offered an overview of the project. He asserted that the proposal is viable and would be beneficial to the community.

Ms. Smith explained that the new construction would be developed in two phases. The first phase would include the renovation of the hotel and the construction of a residential and commercial complex on the northern half of the vacant land. The second phase, a residential and commercial complex, would be built later on the southern portion of the site. The site connects several communities to the east and west. They have addressed several neighborhood issues, adding a supermarket, improving the streetscape, and increasing lighting. Ms. Smith stated that the overall project would contain 450 units; half would be condominiums and half apartments. The street-level sections would contain retail spaces with a supermarket and parking for 650 cars. The supermarket entrance would be located on N. 13th Street. Loading would be located on Fairmount Avenue. The parking would be located above the supermarket with the entrance and exit on Ridge Avenue. The second phase would include more housing and parking. She explained that the link between the new and old would be limited to one story in height. It would be transparent and neutral. They would preserve the light and air around the historic building.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the project would be LEED certified. Ms. Smith stated that the design employs sustainable features. Mr. Doebley said that the Lorraine would act as the anchor of the proposal. He explained that one of the investors is a Dutch solar panel company, which is interested in creating small urban housing units. Mr. Doebley explained the residences would be 400 square-foot studios that would sell for less than \$200,000. He added that the supermarket as well as a café and restaurant on the ground floor of the Lorraine would create activity and promote safety in the area. He noted that the residential units in the Lorraine would be accessed from the new complex through the link at the rear. The commercial space in the Lorraine would be accessed through the historic front entranceway. Mr. Doebley reported that the hotel building has suffered masonry damage from sandblasting. The restoration would attempt to repair this deterioration. Mr. Doebley noted that the project will include many masonry repairs as well as window replacement following the original fenestration. Mr. Doebley suggested that they may seek an approval to remove the "Divine" portion of the signage because of the religious connotation, but retain the "Lorraine Hotel" portion. He also noted that they would reconstruct the historic roof monitors.

Mr. McCoubrey questioned their proposed circulation pattern and asked why the residents would not be able to enter and exit the building directly from Broad Street. Mr. Doelbey stated the front entrance with the mailboxes, concierge, and security will be located in a new section on Ridge Avenue. He explained that, for security reasons, only the restaurant entrance will be on Broad Street.

Mr. Baron asked the applicants if they studied the reuse of the annex, which they propose to demolish. Mr. Powers noted that the annex is not original to the hotel, but was built about one to two years after the main building. Mr. Thomas commented that although the annex is not as grand as the hotel, it has historic significance. Mr. Thomas suggested that the applicants should present an application to the Hardship Committee justifying the demolition of the annex. They may be able to demonstrate that the overall project is not feasible without the demolition of the annex. Earlier, failed attempts at adaptive reuse may be relevant. Mr. Doebley stated that they could not provide adequate egress from the building while developing the annex in a financially feasible manner. Mr. Baron said that there should not be an assumption of hardship if the question had not yet been studied. He asked the applicants to study the feasibility of rehabilitating the annex, which would be preferable. Mr. Thomas noted that the Committee could not recommend approval of the demolition of the annex particularly without a finding of hardship.

Mr. D'Alessandro questioned Ms. Smith on the height of the new buildings. She replied the new buildings will not exceed the height of the existing building. She will echo the rhythm of the historic in the new, but she will not copy the historic. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if they could reduce the height of the new to defer to the historic. Ms. Smith stated that the size of the new complex is dictated by the minimum number of units necessary for a viable project.

Mr. Levy voiced his concern about the added traffic. He asked if any traffic studies had been conducted. Ms. Smith replied that Frank Montgomery, a traffic engineer, did study this question and presented his findings, which demonstrate that the streets can handle the added traffic, to the community.

Mr. Powers asked about the extent of the Commission's jurisdiction over the new construction. Mr. Baron replied the Commission would decide this question for this specific project, but that it has regularly reviewed additions to historic buildings, even if they extend beyond the designation boundaries. Mr. Doebley reported that the various parcels making up the project have various deeds and owners. Mr. Powers noted that the site slopes down away from the historic building, minimizing the impact of the new construction on the older structure.

Mr. Van Wagenberg commented that this development it targeted at young professionals and will help keep young people in the city. It will be an anchor on N. Broad Street and the historic hotel building will be the star of the development.

Mr. Thomas asked if the developers planned to reopen the underground connection between the subway station and the building. Mr. Powers explained that the developers hoped to improve the adjacent subway entrances. Mr. Van Wagenberg noted that SEPTA would make the decisions regarding the subway entrances, but that it was in the interest of the project to improve the connections.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization had nominated the Lorraine Hotel for designation. He remarked that it had consciously included the annex in the

nomination. He asserted that the developers should submit a financial hardship application if they contend that it is not financially feasible to reuse the annex. He stated that his organization will advocate for denial until the hardship is proven. He suggested that the Commission consider a hardship application for the annex separately and not as one aspect of the larger development. Regarding the jurisdiction question, he opined that the new construction is independent of the historic buildings except at that point where they meet. He recommended that the Commission formally and explicitly delineate its jurisdiction in this matter.

Mr. Thomas suggested that the annex may be able to be saved as the connector between the new and old. Mr. Doebley stated that the cost of a new fire stair in the annex will be the determining factor. He rejected Mr. Baron's assertion that this building is very much like those in Old City; he stated that the economics on N. Broad Street are very different from those of Old City.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to the demolition of the rear annex, pursuant to Standards 2, 9, and 10 and §14-2007(7)(j).

1817 DELANCEY PLACE

Owner: Acorn Property Development LLC, principals: Alexander Waddell and Steve Shapiro

Applicant: Alexander G. Waddell

History: Built c. 1856, contributing within the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District.

Project: Construct three-story rear addition, install roof cupola

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story addition with garage to the rear of a large four bay Italianate rowhouse which originally had no rear ell. The rear of the property is presently occupied by a one-story, non-historic garage. The addition would expand and reclad the existing garage to include a pedestrian door and roll-up metal garage door. Above the garage, three stories are proposed. The first story of the addition would occupy the entire width of the property and have a small deck. The second and third floors would only extend three bays wide; decks are also proposed for these stories. The second-floor deck would have a metal railing and the third-story deck would have a masonry parapet. The historic openings at the fourth-floor would be altered. The two eastern most windows would have their sills raised and the other two windows would be replaced by a triple door to access the third-floor deck. The addition would be clad in brick veneer and accented with stone lintels. All new windows would be wood two-over-two, except the triple door at the third floor. The applicant also proposes to install a cupola over the stair well. The stair well currently has a non-historic skylight. A sight-line study submitted by the applicant demonstrates that the proposed cupola would not be visible from Delancey Place.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 10

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Developer Alec Waddell and architect Kevin Rasmussen represented the application.

Mr. Thomas agreed with the staff's recommendation of approval because the rear is only visible from a service alley. Mr. Levy objected to the roll-up garage door and suggested that it would set a precedent for others on the block. The applicant responded that the proposed garage door

is required because of headroom issues with the addition. He also noted that several other neighboring properties have similar roll-up doors.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the proposal, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 10.

834 CHESTNUT STREET

Owner: Ben Franklin Hotel Associates

Applicant: Brett Harman

History: Designed by Horace Trumbauer, built 1923-25, designated 7 January 1982.

Project: Install new awnings and entrance canopy

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install five shed-type awnings and a canopy at a commercial space in the northwest corner of the Benjamin Franklin Hotel. The Sunbrella-fabric awnings would have open sides and would be taupe in color with the name of the restaurant on the skirts. The proposed locations have historic bronze window frames and the surrounding masonry is terracotta. In addition the application proposes to install a canopy with side wind brakes at the entrance to the establishment. The canopy would extend five feet from the façade and would have Sunbrella-fabric skirts and side wind-breaks to match the awnings. The canopy would be illuminated, but no details for the lighting are provided. Also, no attachment details for the canopy and awnings are provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 5, 9 and 10

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Architects Brett Harman and Paul Drzal represented the application.

Mr. Thomas contended that the attachment of the awnings and canopy to the terracotta façade and bronze window frames might damage historic fabric. Mr. Harmon commented that there were several holes from previous attachments in the facade. Mr. Thomas suggested that the best advertisement for a restaurant is the open windows revealing the diners inside. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the ornate historic windows should not be covered. He opposed the awnings and suggested more appropriate signage instead. Ms. Pentz agreed. Mr. Thomas suggested signage inside the glass of the windows.

Mr. Harman stated that his client plans outdoor dining and these awnings would be necessary to shelter the diners. Mr. Thomas rejected the claim that the awnings would shelter outdoor diners. He suggested umbrellas instead. Mr. Harman contended that the canopies would define the outdoor eating locations spatially. Mr. Thomas suggested that this be done with street furniture, not elements that attach to the historic building. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested cleaning the bronze window surrounds to highlight the restaurant.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that his organization holds an easement on the building. He noted that no application for these alterations has been submitted to the Alliance. He observed that he is not sympathetic to the notion of installing awnings on this building. Mr. McCoubrey and Mr. Thomas agreed that awnings and canopies are not appropriate for these openings.

Mr. Harman suggested he would do research to show that the building originally had awnings. He asked if the Committee would look favorably on awnings installed below the transoms. Mr. Thomas replied that they would not be appropriate either.

Mr. Levy suggested that the applicant also consider the Streets Department's requirements.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5, 9 and 10.

18-22 & 24 LETITIA STREET, 31-35 S. 2ND STREET

Owner: EFL Partners, Sam Bradstreet, John Contra

Applicant: Brett Harmann, architect

History: 18-22 Letitia, c. 1855, individually designated, Contributing to Old City District

24 Letitia, c. 1855, individually designated, Contributing to Old City District

31 S. 2nd Street, c. 1840, individually designated, Contributing to Old City District

33 S. 2nd Street, c. 1905, individually designated, Contributing to Old City District

35 S. 2nd Street, c. 1865, individually designated, Significant to Old City District

Project: Façade alterations including storefronts, windows, paving, and fire escapes

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a mixture of legalization and new alterations to a project that the Committee and Commission have reviewed several times. The project involves combining seven buildings which face Letitia and S. 2nd Streets into a residential complex with commercial ground-floor space.

At 20 Letitia Street, the applicant proposes a new storefront with louvered transoms to vent a restaurant kitchen. The Commission approved a new storefront in concept in November 2005 conditioned upon the louvers being removed from the storefront and rerouted to the roof. The applicant has worked with the staff on a design for the storefront doors and windows at 18-24 Letitia Street. The plans show infilling areas of the storefront with granite curbs where there had previously been cellar doors. The applicant proposes to remove the fire escape on the front of 24 S. Letitia Street and install a new one.

On the Black Horse Alley side of 18 Letitia, the applicant proposes to restore the sidewalks, curbs, and basement windows. On the wall above the alley, the applicant's drawings show the cutting of windows in addition to those approved in the last application. On the entry courtyard wall at the back of 18 Letitia, the applicant wishes to legalize windows cut and installed at variance with those approved by the Commission in August 2006. The new narrower windows number three per floor rather than the approved two.

On S. 2nd Street, the plans propose new storefronts with operable café windows at both 33 and 35; both currently have mid-twentieth-century storefronts. The applicant has uncovered a piece of the nineteenth-century storefront at 33 S. 2nd Street including a marble entablature. The applicant also proposes to remove the fire escape on the fronts of 33 and 35 S. 2nd Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of all proposals, with the staff to review details, except the following: denial of the louvered transoms on 20 Letitia Street, where the applicant should seek an alternate location for the venting; denial of the granite curbs in the storefront on Letitia Street; and denial of the removal of the historic marble on S. 2nd Street, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and

10. The windows and storefront details, particularly at 2nd Street, should be revised in conjunction with the staff.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Brett Harman represented the application.

Mr. Baron clarified that the staff is recommending approval of the café windows on 2nd Street with operability. The staff suspects that they were historically operable at 31 but not 33 S. 2nd Street. The staff does object to the specific design with its many tiny panes of glass for both 31 and 33 and proposes to work with the applicant on revising the details. Mr. Baron stated that the marble tablatore at 31 S. 2nd Street has some broken pieces which need work, either patching or perhaps a partial dutchman replacement. He also said that he hoped to inspect the lower soffit of the marble entablature to look for evidence of the number of missing columns. This will, in turn, determine whether there was one window and one door, or a window with two doors.

Mr. McCoubrey noticed that the treatment of the transoms was not indicated on the drawing. Mr. Harmon said they would be new. Mr. McCoubrey asked that this be noted and the details reviewed by the staff.

Mr. Levy questioned the fire escape, which would be located in front of out-swinging doors. Mr. Harman explained they are not operable doors, but he did acknowledge the drawings needed to be corrected. Mr. Harman stated that they are asking to remove the fire escape, which serves as egress from the building, and rebuild it, owing to its deterioration.

Mr. Harman commented on the intake air vents for the restaurant at 22 Letitia Street. He said that they are proposing to install them in the transoms. Mr. DiStefano had engineers study the feasibility of locating them elsewhere in the building. He said that the exhaust ducts have been routed to the roof. They looked into bringing in air below the storefront but the Health Department stated that that would not be acceptable. He said the only other possibility is to locate them on Black Horse Alley, but this is not viable because it is a visible, historic façade.

Mr. Baron asked if routing them to the courtyard would be feasible. Mr. DiStefano, the project manager, stated that they did study this possibility and found that, owing to the fire tower directly behind the kitchen, it is not possible to run them to the courtyard. Mr. Levy asked if the louvers could be placed behind the transom window frame. He suggested moving the louver back in the opening, painting it black, and installing a screen to prevent insect and birds from entering.

Committee members supported the restoration of the paving at Blackhorse Alley, the installation of the window wells, the cutting of the new windows, and the legalization of the windows on the courtyard. The applicant was reminded to follow the approved drawings in the future.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of all aspects of the proposal, with the staff to review details, especially the windows and storefront details, except the following: denial of the granite curbs in the storefront on Letitia Street; and denial of the removal of the historic marble on S. 2nd Street, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

7406 GERMANTOWN AVENUE (AKA 7500 GERMANTOWN AVENUE)

Owner/Applicant: Van B. Strother, New Covenant Church of Philadelphia

History: constructed 1890-1892, Wilson Brothers, architect

Project: Construct elevator tower and new entrance

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of an elevator tower and new entrance in an open court on the south side of this E-shaped building. The construction of the elevator tower will require the demolition of ornamental windows, a chimney, and a dormer as well as cutting through the eave of the roof. The tower itself will be made of decorative cinder block. The construction of the new doorway will include filling in a pointed arch opening, cutting down the base, and installing a door. The fire escape will be altered to avoid the new doorway. A canopy of indeterminate size and materials will project out over the new doorway.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Architect Van Strother represented the application.

Mr. Baron directed the Committee to a letter from the applicant stating that installing the elevator inside the building would be more expensive. The letter does not detail the different costs.

Mr. Strother stated that the Committee reviewed a similar proposal several months ago. At that time, the Committee determined that it needed more information about how the elevator tower would connect to the building.

Mr. Thomas clarified the roles of the Committee on Financial Hardship and the Architectural Committee. He stated that the financial information is beyond the purview of the Architectural Committee and that the Committee reviews the proposal based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He opined that the placing the elevator in the interior would offer the best solution. Mr. D'Alessandro added that the Committee would require a stone cladding if it were to approve an exterior elevator tower because the proposed concrete block does not meet the Standards.

Mr. McCoubrey noted this was the same proposal from the 25 July meeting and that the Committee requested more detailed plans. Mr. Strother asserted that it would be more expensive to place the elevator inside the building. He proposed to prepare an application for the Committee on Financial Hardship. Mr. Baron stated that the Committee on Financial Hardship would not base a recommendation solely on the fact that one solution was more or less expensive than the other, but would rather whether the organization could afford the solution that meets the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

Mr. Strother stated that an interior elevator would have to be a traction rather than hydraulic elevator, which is twice as expensive. He remarked that the elevator cannot be seen from public view and is obstructed by trees. Mr. Thomas explained that in a campus setting, the public view includes views from within the campus as well as outside streets. Also, this area will now include the main entrance for this building.

Mr. Strother stated the organization is open to any materials suggested for the exterior elevator tower. Mr. Thomas explained that any new addition should use compatible materials, but that the interior elevator would be a better solution than the exterior one, even if it were pulled away from the building and clad in compatible materials.

Mr. D'Alessandro suggested working with elevator engineers, who have the expertise to address the salient issues such as avoiding the electrical service in the basement. He remarked there are other ways to install an elevator. Mr. Strother then asked it would it be necessary to appear before the Committee again if the elevator is shifted to the interior. He asked if the Committee would recommend approval of his proposal if the top of the elevator is lowered and leveled at the roof line. Committee members responded that the applicant should endeavor to preserve the chimney and dormer. They explained that the Committee and Commission may need to review the proposal if it includes exterior changes to the building.

Mr. Levy asked if the elevator could be moved to the other side of the lobby, opposite the electrical service. Mr. Strother stated that, owing to the grade difference, this would necessitate adding a ramp in the courtyard. Mr. McCoubrey pointed to a central location that would miss the electrical box in the basement and allow connection to the currently proposed grade entrance. He pointed out that this might be a less expensive option because it would require less maintenance than a proposal piercing the roof and needing masonry upkeep. Mr. Strother said that these solutions would be worth exploring.

Laura Sienna, the executive director of the West Mount Airy Neighbors, recognized the efforts of the church and, noting that the property is 36 acres, and acknowledged its stewardship of the large property.

Mr. Baron commented that, at this point, the applicant has not provided enough information to forward his proposal to the Hardship Committee.

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

2232 GREEN STREET

Owner: Sol Dembinsky

Applicant: Brett Harman

History: Built c. 1856, Designated contributing, Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Replace front door and windows

OVERVIEW: The property owner previously presented an application to the Commission for the legalization of the installation of approximately 10 vinyl windows in the place of existing vinyl window and a side door. The Commission denied that application pursuant to Standards 6 and 9 on 11 August 2006. This application proposes to install wood two-over-two windows in all the front façade windows and two wood two-over-two windows on the side façade. Two new solid wood doors are proposed for the front and side facades.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the doors; denial of the proposed windows, but approval of wood one-over-one windows, with arched windows not arched transoms in the bay, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Architects Brett Harman and Paul Drzal represented the application.

Ms. Cote noted that the original windows may have been two-over-two, but that one-over-one windows are now more appropriate owing to the many alterations to window openings.

Committee members noted that the plans lacked notations indicating the locations of vinyl windows and suggested this be corrected.

Mr. Harman stated that this is a condominium building; half of the units sold and occupied. He explained that his client intends to install the correct windows as the units change ownership. His client was concerned about inconvenience to the residents.

Mr. D'Alessandro was adamant that the Committee review this application based on the Standards, not on the developer's access or lack thereof to units. He asserted that the violations must be corrected. Ms. Pentz concurred. Mr. McCoubrey also noted that the side of the building is as visible as the front.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS: Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the doors, but denial of the windows, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

ALLEN LANE STATION

Owner: SEPTA

Applicant: Michael J. Cuddy

History: Built 1885 Architects: W. Bleddyn Powell & William H. Brown, designated 8/6/1981

Project: Construct ADA ramp and raise platforms for ADA access, rebuild shelters and canopies with salvaged, new and replicated materials, restore bridge.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct ADA ramps and to demolish the existing low-level platforms and replace them with pre-cast high-level platforms for ADA access. The existing pedestrian bridge will remain in place and will be rehabilitated with salvaged materials or new, replicated materials. The existing stairs will be demolished and replaced with pre-cast concrete sections. The existing shelters and canopies will be demolished and rebuilt on the new elevated platforms with salvaged or new materials to match the existing. New roofing is proposed for the canopies, shelters, and a portion of the station building. The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar application last month and requested more detailed information regarding the pedestrian bridge railing height and the effect of the raised platforms on the shelters. That application was withdrawn prior to the Commission meeting.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Engineer Len Nardone, architect Mariana Thomas, and Bill Caden of SEPTA represented the application.

Mr. Thomas observed that the new application answered many of his questions from the previous meeting. He commended the project. He asked about the connection from the outbound shelter, which will be elevated four feet, and the station, which will be stationary. The applicants displayed updated drawings. Mr. Thomas and Mr. McCoubrey agreed that the design solution for the walkway roof running between the shelter and the stationary station was appropriate.

Mr. Thomas asked about the railing on the bridge, especially the solid center section which extends up to the roof. He noted that the Committee had requested a revision to the design at the previous review to retain the historic openness and transparency. Mr. Nardone explained that mesh is not an option for his client, although they are amenable to Plexiglass or another solid but transparent material. Ms. Thomas contradicted her colleague, stating that Plexiglass is not acceptable to SEPTA because it scratches. Ms. Thomas and Mr. Nardone agreed to discuss the question with SEPTA and revised the design accordingly. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee would accept the proposed reduction in the height of the railing for safety reasons.

Mr. Thomas asked about the reduction in the height of the inbound stairs to accommodate the raising of the platform. Mr. Nardone displayed the existing and proposed drawings. Mr. Thomas stated that the solution was appropriate.

Mr. Thomas noted a photograph from the 1980s which showed the inbound platform with windows and doors. He asked if SEPTA intended to replace the now-missing windows and doors. Mr. Caden stated that SEPTA would replicate the window frames without sash or glass, but would not replicate the doors. He asserted that windows and doors present safety, vandalism, and maintenance problems. Mr. Caden stated that, if the windows alone prevented an approval of the project, he would ask SEPTA to reconsider its decision not to replicate them. However, he asserted that SEPTA does not prefer to replicate the windows or doors.

Mr. McCoubrey excused himself from the meeting.

Mr. Thomas and Mr. D'Alessandro remarked that they would be willing to compromise on the doors, allowing metal rather than the original wood. Ms. Thomas responded that the structure would not support heavy metal doors. Mr. Nardone stated that the windows and doors do not exist today; therefore, they should not be required to replicate them. Mr. Thomas replied that the doors and windows existed at the time of designation. Ms. Thomas asserted the Committee was changing her client's program with its request for the doors and windows. Mr. Thomas replied that the Committee bases its review on the Standards of the Secretary of the Interior. The Commission can take other factors into account. Mr. Caden stated that SEPTA has not replicated doors and windows in its other recent restorations. Mr. Thomas and Mr. D'Alessandro noted that their review is predicated on the Standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the bridge railing is revised to be more transparent and doors and windows are installed in their historic locations in the inbound shelter, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

1322 PINE STREET

History: Built c. 1860, Designated 3/28/1961

Owner/Applicant: Phillip W. Cuffey

Project: Enclose rear porch, construct two rear decks

OVERVIEW: This application proposes maintenance and restoration work for all facades of the building. It also proposes to retain the windows in the side elevation of the rear ell while sealing them off on the interior. This application also proposes to enclose the existing second-story rear porch and construct two new roof decks on the third and fourth floors while maintaining the

historic roof line. The iron detailing on the second-story porch is a character defining feature and should be retained and remain visible from the exterior with the enclosure of the porch.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of proposed maintenance and restoration work, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6. Denial of the demolition of the second-story rear wall and second-story enclosed porch, as submitted, pursuant to Standard 2. Approval of the roof decks with a black metal railing on the third-story roof deck, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Owner Phillip Cuffey and architect Tom Holloman represented the application.

Mr. Baron observed that the ornate ironwork on the rear porch was an important historic feature. The Committee concurred and added that the existing rear brick wall should be retained as a remnant pier and lintel in the rear second-floor bedroom. Mr. Baron noted that the staff should work with the applicant on the details; for example, the basement windows are shown incorrectly.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval with the retention of the rear second-floor porch ironwork, and partial demolition of the second-floor rear wall with pilasters and a cross-beam expressing the previous existence of the rear wall, with staff to review details.

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

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

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

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

Standard 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.

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