

**THE MINUTES OF THE 529TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**9 SEPTEMBER 2006
1515 ARCH STREET, ROOM 18029
MICHAEL SKLAROFF, ESQ., CHAIR**

PRESENT

Michael Sklaroff, Esq., Chair
Joseph James, Department of Public Property
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Kathleen Murray, Office of the City Council President
David Perri, Department of Licenses & Inspections
Vincent Rivera, AIA
David Schaaf, RA, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Harris Steinberg, FAIA
Thomas Sugrue, Ph.D.
Norman Tissian
Scott Wilds, Office of Housing & Community Development

Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Lawrence Copeland, Senior Attorney, Law Department
Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor, Law Department

ALSO PRESENT

Adam E. Laver, Blank Rome LLP
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Theresa Stulhman, Fairmount Park Commission
Lalit Aggomal, Overbrook Farms resident
Sissie Lipton, Society Hill Civic Association
Henry Lipton, Society Hill Civic Association
Stephen Maffei, Landmark Design
Craig Deutsch, Harman Deutsch Architects
Tim Wood
Cynthia Roberts, Spruce Hill resident
Brian McAllister, Cubit Real Estate, Inc.
Kerry Nolan, Gluckman Mayner Architects
James Karmolinski, Kelly/Maiello Architects
Tom McPayle, Fairmount Park Historic Preservation Trust
Ted Newbold, 112 Cuthbert Street
Stephen Pollock, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP
Robert Venturi, Venturi Scott Brown Associates
Carey Yonce, Venturi Scott Brown Associates
Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP
G. Craig Schelter, Schelter & Associates
George Thomas, Civic Visions, LP
John Turchi, Turchi Properties
Constantine Doukakis, Keast & Hood Co.

Carl Primavera, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers, LLP
Stephanie Resnick
Arthur Karafin
Leanne Litkin

529TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

Michael Sklaroff, Chair, recognized the presence of a quorum and called the 529th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission to order at 9:02 a.m. Commissioners Sklaroff, James, Merriman, Murray, Perri, Rivera, Schaaf, Steinberg, Sugrue, Tissian, and Wilds were in attendance.

MINUTES OF THE 528TH STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Upon a motion proffered by Mr. Sugrue and seconded by Mr. Rivera, the Commission unanimously approved the minutes of the 528th Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 11 August 2006.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORIC DESIGNATION, 22 AUGUST 2006, THOMAS SUGRUE, CHAIR

1200-1202 CHESTNUT STREET, BENEFICIAL SAVINGS FUND SOCIETY BUILDING

Owner at the time of notice: City of Philadelphia, Trustee of the Stephen Girard Will
Current owner: Ches 12 Partners, LP

DESIGNATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation recommended the adoption of the nomination, the designation of 1200-1202 Chestnut Street as historic, and its listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Designation Criteria A, D, E, J and H of Section 14-2007(5) of the Philadelphia Code.

OVERVIEW: The Beneficial Saving Fund Society building possesses significance as an outstanding example of an early twentieth-century Classical Revival commercial building, designed by famed Philadelphia architect Horace Trumbauer. It also possesses significance to the social, commercial, and banking history of Philadelphia. The Beneficial Saving Fund Society building meets designation criteria A, D, E, J, and H of Section 14-2007(5) of the Philadelphia Code.

The Beneficial Saving Fund Society was founded in 1853. The bank opened for operations in a small building on the east side of Chestnut Street in 1855. In 1881, the board of trustees selected Edwin Forrest Durang to design a new structure for the institution. This building was expanded by 1900 and later demolished in 1916 to make way for the current structure designed by Horace Trumbauer.

Horace Trumbauer was a nationally prominent architect associated with the Beaux Arts movement of the early twentieth-century. His designs are of the caliber of those of the other leaders of the movement such as McKim, Mead & White and Carrere & Hastings. Trumbauer's bank building is highly significant architecturally.

Moreover, the banking institution housed in the architecturally significant building is very important to the social and economic history of Philadelphia. Leaders of the Irish Catholic community founded the bank to provide financial services to the immigrant

community, which was underserved by the city's other banks.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the nomination and Committee recommendation to the Commission. No one represented the property owner.

Ms. Murray asked the staff why it had nominated this building. She also asked if anyone had requested the preparation of the nomination. Mr. Farnham explained that the staff routinely prepares nominations when its workload permits. He noted the staff had slowly collected material for this nomination overall several years. He stated that no particular event had triggered the preparation of this nomination, but that the staff had planned for many years to nominate this building because it is an important and well-preserved example of architect Horace Trumbauer's significant oeuvre. Mr. Steinberg concurred, stating that he deemed the building an outstanding example of Trumbauer's work.

ACTION: Mr. Steinberg moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation, designate 1200-1202 Chestnut Street as historic, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Designation Criteria A, D, E, J and H of Section 14-2007(5) of the Philadelphia Code. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 10 to 0. Ms. Murray abstained.

3064 HOLME AVENUE

Owner: City of Philadelphia, Fairmount Park Commission

DESIGNATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation recommended the amendment of the Greenbelt Knoll Historic District with the designation of 3064 Holme Avenue as a contributing resource in the district and its listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Designation Criteria A, B, G, and J of Section 14-2007(5) of the Philadelphia Code.

OVERVIEW: At its May 2006 meeting, the Committee on Historic Designation reviewed the nomination of the Greenbelt Knoll Historic District and recommended that a two-acre wooded tract to the west at 3064 Holme Avenue, which had been part of the original Greenbelt Knoll development, be included within the district. The wooded tract had not been included within the district boundaries proposed in the nomination. Although the Committee on Historic Designation recommended including the wood tract within the district, the Philadelphia Historical Commission did not designate it when it designated the district at its June 2006 meeting. The Commission chose not to include the parkland because it had not notified the property owner at least 60 days in advance of the first public review of the potential designation. The Commission has now satisfied the notice requirement and may consider amending the district boundaries to include the wooded tract within the Greenbelt Knoll Historic District.

Prominent civil rights activist Morris Milgram created the Greenbelt Knoll residential community in 1956 and 1957. It was the first racially-integrated suburban housing development in Philadelphia and one of the first in the country. The wooded tract to the west of the residences, which was owned by the Greenbelt Knoll Park Association, was part of the development from its founding, but was not improved as a private communal recreation area for the residents until the early 1960s. In 1962, architect Harry Duncan, landscape architect Margaret Lancaster Duncan, and engineers of the John F. Thornton Co. improved the park, which they connected to the residences with a path and bridge. They landscaped the area and added a swimming pool, wading pool, changing rooms,

and other recreational facilities. For more than two decades, the residents of Greenbelt Knoll enjoyed the recreation area. However, by 1985, they could no longer care for the park. That year, they transferred the property to the Fairmount Park Commission, which demolished the structures and returned the land to its natural state.

The park at Greenbelt Knoll was an integral part of the landmark development and is therefore eligible for inclusion on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. It fulfills Designation Criteria a, b, g, and j as delineated in paragraph 5 of the City's "Historic Buildings" ordinance, Section 14-2007 of the Philadelphia Code. Satisfying Criterion a, the park is an important part of Greenbelt Knoll, which was one of the nation's first integrated suburban housing developments, and therefore has significant character, interest or value as part of the development, heritage, and cultural characteristics of the City, Commonwealth, and Nation and is associated with Morris Milgram as well as residents Robert N.C. Nix and the Rev. Leon H. Sullivan, persons significant in the past. Satisfying Criterion b, the park is associated with an event of importance to the history of the City, Commonwealth, and Nation, the open housing movement. Criterion g is satisfied by the Greenbelt Knoll park, which "is part of or related to a square, park, or other distinctive area which should be preserved." And finally, satisfying Criterion j, the park at Greenbelt Knoll exemplifies the cultural, political, economic, social, and historical heritage of the neighborhood and community.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the proposal and Committee recommendation to the Commission.

Mr. Sklaroff asked why this property was not included within the original district nomination, especially if it was an integral part of the district. Mr. Farnham explained that the parcel was a part of the original Greenbelt Knoll development. It contained the pool and recreation facilities for the housing development. The community members who prepared the original nomination did not include this property because they had collectively forgotten this segment of their own history. Greenbelt Knoll sold the property to the Fairmount Park Commission in 1985 because it could not continue to maintain it. Although the members of the Committee on Historic Designation had immediately recognized that this property should be included within the district, the original nomination could not be revised in time to include 3064 Holme Avenue because adequate notice of the consideration of the nomination had not been issued to the Fairmount Park Commission, the owner. The Commission has now issued the proper notice and the Fairmount Park Commission supports the designation and the inclusion of the parcel in the district.

ACTION: Mr. Steinberg moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation, amend the Greenbelt Knoll Historic District with the designation of 3064 Holme Avenue as a contributing resource in the district, and list it on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Designation Criteria A, B, G, and J of Section 14-2007(5) of the Philadelphia Code. Ms. Merriman seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 10 to 0. Mr. James abstained.

218-220 ARCH STREET

Owner: 218 Arch Street, LP; Michael Yaron, president, Yaron Properties Inc.

DESIGNATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation recommended the rescissions of the individual designations of 218 and 220 Arch Street from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, provided the Old City Historic District and Historic Street Paving District designations for 218-226 Arch Street and Little Boy's Court are maintained, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the *Rules and Regulations*.

OVERVIEW: This application requests the rescissions of the individual designations of the vacant lots at 218 and 220 Arch Street from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The properties are currently consolidated with other vacant lots and are known as 218-226 Arch Street. The Philadelphia Historical Commission designated the two properties, as well as numerous others in Old City, on 6 January 1977. The Commission approved the demolition of the buildings at 218 and 220 Arch Street on 29 May 1985 to clear the site for the construction of a hotel. The hotel was never built. A parking lot now occupies the site. The current owner plans to develop the site with a retail and residential building. That owner requests that the Commission rescind the individual designations pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the *Rules and Regulations*. He claims that, with the demolition approved by the Commission in 1985, "the resource has ceased to meet the criteria for listing on the Register because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed." Note that the Commission designated the parcel at 218-226 Arch Street as part of the Old City Historic District on 12 December 2003. It is and would remain designated and classified as a non-contributing resource in the district. Also, a small portion of the parcel at its eastern edge is designated as part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. Little Boy's Court, a narrow cobblestone street which includes the oldest surviving street paving in Philadelphia, runs south from Arch Street to Cuthbert Street across this parcel. Little Boy's Court is not an open, public street, but is entirely on private property including this parcel.

DISCUSSION: Mr Sklaroff recused and passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue.

Mr. Farnham presented the application and Committee recommendation to the Commission. Attorney Adam Laver and developer Robert Downs represented the application.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance asserted that the Commission should not rescind the designation. He stated that the Commission had maintained the individual designation of a site on N. 2nd Street with a similar history; the building had been completely lost in a fire, yet the Commission used its discretion and preserved the designation. He said this case was very similar: both were designated prior to the creation of the district; both properties were demolished; and both were proposed for rescission during the planning stages of a new development. Although Mr. Gallery praised the developer in this case, he asserted that the proposed building is too large and not appropriately scaled for the district. He noted its proximity to Christ Church. Responding to Mr. Gallery's assertion, Mr. Wilds noted that the Commission eventually rescinded the designation of the N. 2nd Street site. Mr. Gallery stated that he did not have an opportunity to research the history of this rescission proposal, but he believed that, if rescinded, it was not rescinded until the new proposal had been reviewed. Mr. Steinberg suggested the creation of a task force to explore the Commission's jurisdiction over new construction within historic districts. He noted that the Committee had recommended approval of the rescission because it determined that the current owner

played no role in the demolition of the buildings that stood on this site. Mr. Gallery stated that he supports the Committee on Historic Designation's recommendation, but noted that it is a technical advisory committee. The Commission has the discretion to consider broader issues; it should exercise its discretion in this case because of the implications of the proposal. Mr. Tissian opined that the Commission would have a stronger position in the review of any development if it did not rescind the individual designations. Mr. Farnham noted that the Commission may retain plenary jurisdiction even if it rescinds the individual designations. The eastern edge of the site is designated as part of the Historic Street Paving District. Mr. James stated that the Commission should defer a decision until the proposed development is presented. Mr. Wilds agreed. Mr. Steinberg noted that Mr. Gallery is attempting to guide the Commission toward a new policy on construction in historic districts. Mr. Wilds agreed, but remarked that the Commission's jurisdiction over new construction in historic districts is already clearly defined by ordinance and *Rules & Regulations*. Mr. Wilds stated that only an amendment to the Commission's ordinance would grant it additional powers over the review of new construction on vacant lots in historic districts.

Mr. Laver stated that the question before the Commission is very narrow: Does the rescission application meet the requirements of the ordinance and *Rules & Regulations*? He asserted that it does. No historic resources survive at the sites. He also noted that the Commission did not impose any conditions on the demolitions of these historic buildings at the time of their approvals. Mr. James asked if the current owner was the owner at the time of demolitions. Mr. Laver stated that the current owner recently purchased the properties and played no role in the demolitions. Mr. Steinberg asked if the plans for the development had been submitted to the Architectural Committee. Mr. Laver stated that he did not have a date for the review of the new development. Mr. Gallery corrected that they had been submitted and then withdrawn.

ACTION: Mr. Steinberg moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and rescind the individual designations of 218 and 220 Arch Street from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, provided the Old City Historic District and Historic Street Paving District designations for 218-226 Arch Street and Little Boy's Court are maintained, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the *Rules and Regulations*. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 9 to 1. Mr. Tissian dissented. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

5319-21 GERMANTOWN AVENUE

Owner: Theresa Williams, Around the Clock Home Health Care

DESIGNATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Committee on Historic Designation recommended the rescission of the individual designation of 5319-5321 Germantown Avenue from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the *Rules and Regulations*.

OVERVIEW: This application requests the rescission of the individual designation of the property at 5319-5321 Germantown Avenue from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places. The Philadelphia Historical Commission designated the eighteenth-century building on 24 November 1964. The building was neglected for years. The Department of Licenses & Inspections issued numerous property maintenance violations between 1997 and 2004, but the owner did not correct the problems. The property was sold at a sheriff's sale in 2005. The new buyer commissioned an engineering report, but never

undertook the promised stabilization work. In April 2006, he sold it to the current owners, who were unaware of the historic designation and planned to demolish the building and erect a small office building for their business.

The building had been a safety hazard for several years. During the City Council's budget hearings in early 2006, Councilwoman Donna Reed Miller requested that the Commission facilitate the elimination of the hazardous condition. The Department declared it "Imminently Dangerous" in March 2006. Three separate engineers inspected the house in the past year. Daniel Banks, P.E. inspected it in April 2005 and determined that sections of the house had collapsed or were in imminent danger of collapse. Bala Consulting Engineers, Inc. determined in June 2006 that the building "has deteriorated to the point that it is on the verge of collapsing at any moment." Suzanne Pentz of Keast & Hood inspected the building for the Commission in July 2006 and concluded that localized collapses were imminent, but that the building as a whole could continue to stand. However, she determined that, owing to the interior collapses, there was no safe means for contractors to stabilize the building. With great regret, she decided that complete demolition was the only feasible option. Following Ms. Pentz's advice, the memorandum of agreement with the Department, and the *Rules & Regulations*, the Commission's staff approved a demolition permit on 17 July 2006. The building was demolished soon thereafter.

With the demolition approved by the Commission in 2006, the property satisfies the requirement for rescission stipulated in Section 5.5.c.1 of the *Rules and Regulations*: "the resource has ceased to meet the criteria for listing on the Register because the qualities that caused its original entry have been lost or destroyed."

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sugrue passed the gavel back to Mr. Sklaroff. Mr. Farnham presented the rescission request and recommendation to the Commission.

ACTION: Mr. Steinberg moved to adopt the recommendation of the Committee on Historic Designation and rescind the individual designation of 5319-5321 Germantown Avenue from the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, pursuant to Section 5.5.c.1 of the *Rules and Regulations*. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

Mr. Sklaroff acknowledged the silent protest at the rear of the meeting room. Holding signs, the group protested the Commission's apparent lack of progress on the processing of the pending district nominations for Spruce Hill, Overbrook Farms, East Falls, and Parkside. Mr. Sklaroff entered their written statement into the record. He announced that the Commission would hold a public discussion of the district designation issue at the start of its meeting on 13 October 2006.

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 29 AUGUST 2006, VINCENT RIVERA, CHAIR

135 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: 135 S. 18th Street Associates, LP; Korman Communities

Applicant: Thomas P. Witt, Esq.

History: 1913, McIlvaine & Roberts, architects

Project: Replacement of main entrance and exterior illumination

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend the following:

1. approval of the removal of the entrance canopy;
2. denial of the removal of the doors, spandrel panel, and windows and installation of the frameless glass door and window system within the grand entranceway, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9; however, the spandrel panel may be removed if it determined to be non-historic;
3. denial of the light fixtures at the entrance, pursuant to Standard 6;
4. approval of the top-floor lighting, with the staff to review wiring and attachment details;
5. approval of the removal of the non-historic storefront and restoration of the façade on 18th Street, with the staff to review details;
6. approval of the removal of awnings, signage, non-historic cladding, and security grates and restoration of the bronze frames and surrounds at the storefronts, with the staff to review details;
7. approval of the repair of the limestone façade, with the staff to review details;
8. approval of the signage, with the staff to review mounting details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes several alterations to the early twentieth-century residential building at the northeast corner of 18th and Walnut Streets.

It proposes to remove the entrance canopy as well as the main entrance doors, stone or stucco panel, and mezzanine-level windows within the grand entranceway and replace them with a frameless glass door and window system. The canopy and entrance doors are non-historic, but the limestone panel and mezzanine-level windows are original. The application also proposes to replace the light fixtures at the entrance with sleek contemporary fixtures.

The application proposes to add exterior lighting at the top story of the building. No details about the wiring and mounting of the lights have been provided; the number and sizes of wiring and mounting penetrations in the stone façade should be minimized.

The application proposes to remove a non-historic storefront on 18th Street and restore the façade. It proposes to remove awnings, signage, non-historic cladding, and security grates at several storefronts; repair the limestone façade; and restore the bronze frames and surrounds. It proposes to add non-illuminated signage on the 18th and Walnut Street facades.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sklaroff passed the gavel to Mr. Sugrue and recused because of “other relationships with the party.” Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Attorney Thomas Witt, designer Joan Pierpoline, and developer Larry Korman of Korman Communities represented the application.

Mr. Witt summarized the work already completed at the site. He also provided an

overview of the proposed improvements. He noted the owner's desire for a grand entrance and lobby and observed that that desire is the impetus for much of this proposal. He stated that the current, cramped entrance is unfitting to the building and its new use as a luxury apartment house. He stated that their application should be approved because it meets Standards 1 and 3. He asserted that the extant doors and lights create a false sense of history. The proposed doors and lights would be clearly discerned as contemporary features.

Ms. Pierpoline prefaced her remarks by stating that she is "well aware of the historic fabric of Philadelphia and of all of the concerns of the Commission." She reported on the desire to make a grander lobby and entrance. She explained that the doors are not historic, but the mezzanine-level windows may be historic. She reported that the spandrel panel could not be assessed until the canopy is removed. She said that the two-story glazed entrance would be appropriately grand. She stated that the glass would disappear, enhancing the limestone surround. She said that viewers would not be confused by the new entry. It would be perceived as contemporary; an undocumented restoration would be falsely historic. She suggested that the Commission "look very, very closely at what is there, and what is real and what is not, and the decision should be made on enhancing the building." She said that her "primary concern" was to maintain the usage of the building in accordance with the Secretary's Standards.

Mr. Sugrue asked for clarification on the mezzanine windows in the entranceway. Ms. Pierpoline said that her historic consultant, Christopher Fry, was unable to determine whether they are original. The spandrel in the doorway has been stuccoed; the doors and light fixtures are not original. Mr. Sugrue noted that the Commission is being asked to make a determination with incomplete information; Ms. Pierpoline has stated that she and her consultant do not know what sections of the entranceway are original and what has been added or altered. Mr. Witt explained that their research has been exhaustive, but inconclusive. Ms. Pierpoline stated that her engineers have determined that the lobby was a double-height space originally; they will restore it.

Mr. Wilds contended that old but not necessarily original fabric may have historic significance of its own. He stated the mezzanine windows in the entranceway certainly appear to be original; they are similar to adjacent windows on the building. He concluded that the case had not been made "to move ahead with the radically modern design."

Mr. Steinberg stated that he has "serious concerns" about the proposal. He opined that the architect's original intent appears to have been to include smaller scale elements within the larger limestone frame. He suggested that the architect prepare a revised design that "acknowledges the sense of scale, delicacy, and pedestrian experience" of the original design. He encouraged a restoration. He stated that the large glass doorway system set flush with the exterior was vacuous and lacking in detail.

Mr. Schaaf encouraged the applicant to speak to the Art Commission about the signage. Mr. Witt stated that he did not believe that the Art Commission has jurisdiction over the proposed signage. Mr. Schaaf confirmed that it does.

Mr. Korman stated that he and his family have a long history of restoring and rehabilitating historic buildings in Philadelphia. He also observed that he is investing a large sum of money in this property. He said that with the proposed entrance would add significantly to the grandeur of the building. He stated: "It hurts that we've put so much

into this building and the one little thing we're asking for we're not being permitted to get."

ACTION: Mr. Riviera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the removal of the entrance canopy; the installation of the top-floor lighting, with the staff to review wiring and attachment details; the removal of the non-historic storefront and restoration of the façade on 18th Street, with the staff to review details; the removal of awnings, signage, non-historic cladding, and security grates and the restoration of the bronze frames and surrounds at the storefronts, with the staff to review details; the repair of the limestone façade, with the staff to review details; the signage, with the staff to review mounting details; and deny the removal of the doors, windows, and spandrel panel (unless determined to be non-historic) and the installation of the frameless glass door and window system within the grand entranceway, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 6, and 9; and the light fixtures at the entrance, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Tissian seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 10 to 0. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

112 MARKET STREET

Owner: Jung Wha Ahn

Applicant: Harold Lichtman, GLP Architects

History: c. 1830; top two stories demolished c. 1910; storefront installed 1988

Project: Construct front façade and three-story addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the proposal, pursuant to the Commission's approval in concept.

OVERVIEW: The Commission reviewed and approved this project in concept in December 2005. The current proposal for final approval complies with the Commission concept approval. The application proposes demolishing the storefront and second-story brick façade, rebuilding the lost third and fourth stories, adding a penthouse, and constructing a cast-stone storefront and brick façade. The penthouse would be set back 15 feet from the front façade and clad in cast stone. A roof deck would be located between the front façade and penthouse and would be hidden behind a tall front parapet. The rear of the building is completely hidden from any public view.

The extant building is two stories in height. It was originally four stories tall, but was cut down, probably about 1910. The brick at the second-story front façade and the third-story, stone window sills survive from the original nineteenth-century building, but nothing else on the exterior is original. The important metal cornice added in 1910, which completed the new two-story building, has been lost. The second-story window openings have been enlarged and the second-story sills are non-historic. The extant storefront, which is in poor condition, was installed in 1988.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Architect Harold Lichtman represented the application.

Mr. Farnham explained that current proposal complies with the Commission's approval in concept of December 2005.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, pursuant to the Commission's approval in concept. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

832-838 LOMBARD STREET, CENTRAL PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

Owner: Masada Custom Builders

Applicant: David Amburn, architect

History: built 1846, William Johnston for historically Black congregation

Project: Rehabilitation and rooftop addition

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

OVERVIEW: The Commission approved a similar proposal in concept to convert the long-vacant property to a single-family house. The earlier approval in concept included a very similar rooftop addition at the rear and some restoration. Although the applicant had previously applied to remove the stucco from the side walls, testing revealed that this would severely damage the brick. The applicant now wishes to re-stucco with a smooth finish on the sides. Two additions on the side would follow the general design in a taller format than the additions seen in an historic photograph.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission.

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

1620 NORTH STREET

Owner: Spring Garden Community Development Corporation

Applicant: John Bushnell, architect

History: carriage house c. 1855, Contributing to Spring Garden Historic District

Project: Rooftop addition, façade alterations

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval as submitted.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to the visible side façade and roof of this carriage house. The Commission previously approved a renovation of the building, which included a rear roof deck with a stair-house. During construction a contractor error resulted in the demolition of the front façade, which has now been rebuilt. This application calls for altering the window pattern on the side façade, adding a rear bay expanding the stairhouse with a penthouse on the roof for an extra bedroom. The deck formerly approved for the rear would be shifted forward on the roof but would likely not be visible from the street.

The staff suggests that the bedroom penthouse be set back six feet from the side of the building preserving a sense of the original height of the building and minimizing the visibility of the penthouse.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect John Bushnell represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff asked why the staff had forwarded the application to the Commission for review. Mr. Baron stated that the stair house previously approved was a small addition and that the newly proposed penthouse is perceived as an entire floor addition. Mr. Wilds asked if the proposed addition is visible from a public right-of-way. Mr. Baron answered that it is visible from North Street. Mr. Bushnell stated that the addition is set back from the front and only visible obliquely. Mr. Bushnell noted that the space between the properties is used for deeded parking.

ACTION: Ms. Murray moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal as submitted. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

326 S. 24TH STREET, A.K.A 2404 DELANCEY PLACE

Owner: Razak Buhn

Applicant: Mark Monteith, architect

History: house c. 1885, garage c. 1980

Project: demolish and construct garage, garden gate, rear façade alterations

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes modifications to an L-shaped property including changes to a gate along 24th Street, the cutting and installation of new windows on the rear façade of the house, and the demolition of the garage on Delancey Place and its replacement with a new garage and deck. The garage on Delancey Street will have a second-story faux façade to provide the deck with privacy. It is detailed with Queen Anne Revival inspired details based on the house and the adjacent structure to the east. Two of the new windows on the back of the house would have distinctive Queen Anne inspired pane configurations where we have no evidence that any existed historically.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application.

Mr. Wilds asked about the design for the new gate. Mr. Baron directed him to Page A3.0 in the plans. Mr. Wilds opined that the proposed is an improvement over the existing. Mr. James asked about the fire-escape ladder. Mr. Baron stated that the existing fire escape was not required by code. The owner is removing it, but will add the ladder to maintain an escape route.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal as submitted, with the staff to review details. Mr. James seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

228 RACE STREET

Owner/Applicant: Frank White

History: c. 1750; individually designated; Significant in the Old City Historic District.

Project: legalize stucco

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6.

OVERVIEW: This proposal calls for legalizing partially completed work to stucco the Bread Street façade of this very old structure. The owner believes that the stucco will repair the brick wall. This building is extremely old and significant and together with other old houses adjacent on this block makes up an important streetscape similar to Elfreth's Alley and Cuthbert Street. The owner's contractor removed the character-defining two-stage brick beltcourse with a hammer and chisel. The contractor also removed wood windows and glass block infill, replacing them with vinyl. This application proposes legalizing the masonry work only; it does not address other illegal work

The façade does need repair. It has not been properly maintained and large amounts of water from an air conditioner have been allowed to run down it. However, stucco never cures structural issues.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Frank White, the owner, represented the application.

Mr. White stated that he would like to stucco the building "to make it look nicer for Old City." He reported that it was built in three stages and that there are cracks between the stages. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the Committee contends that the brick can be restored. Mr. White disagreed. Mr. Sklaroff observed that this building, which was built about 1750, is a "treasure." Mr. White noted that the building includes several different types of bricks that cannot be matched. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the applicant should work with the staff to find a brick match and restore the façade. If no good matches are found, he may return to the Commission. Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Baron if the brick was available and if the façade could be restored. Mr. Baron replied that salvaged brick is available and that the bulging façade can be rebuilt.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, and 6. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

105-117 S. 7TH STREET

Owner: L-A Liberty Square Associates

Applicant: Guy Gindhart

History: built 1923 for Beck Engraving Company, Contributing to the Society Hill District

Project: legalize cornice and parapet

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend legalization of the repairs.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize work done on an emergency basis without a permit. Last winter a portion of the parapet and cornice collapsed into 8th Street and upon inspection it became apparent that other portions were in a precarious state as well. The applicants rebuilt sections of the parapet and cornice, salvaged the marble

cornice where they could, and used new cast stone and brick in place of the old along 8th Street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff noted a recent Commonwealth Court decision in which a judge decided that the Commission must adhere strictly to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He asked Mr. Reuter to elaborate. Mr. Reuter noted that the City and the developer of the property in question had requested to reargue the case. Mr. Sklaroff remarked that the Commission should perhaps amend its Rules if the decision stands. It noted that the York Row case has implications for the current application. Mr. Reuter asked if this work had resulted from a violation issued by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Mr. Perri responded that the Department had issued a violation. Mr. Sklaroff concluded that the Commission could exercise its standard discretionary powers during review of this application. Mr. Steinberg stated that the Commission had based the York Row decision on special circumstances including the need to collect and drain large amounts of water from the façade of the tower. He stated that the decision had not been made lightly. Mr. Sklaroff concluded that its legal counsel has advised the Commission that it is not bound to deny this application owing to the substitute materials, but has the discretion to approve it.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and legalize the repairs. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1636 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: George Bochetto Esq.

Applicant: Mark D'Alonzo

History: Built c. 1875. Designated on 2/8/1995

Project: Fourth-floor addition with roof deck.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 1, 2, 5, and 9 and the Addition Guidelines.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rooftop addition and deck. The property sits on a corner parcel and is terminated by a prominent mansard. The proposed rooftop addition would be a copy of the historic mansard, thus creating a double mansard. This addition would require the demolition of a chimney. The roof deck would be located on the southern end of the historic mansard.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal and Committee recommendation to the Commission. Architect Mark D'Alonzo represented the application.

Mr. D'Alonzo began by stating that he is not attempting to copy the existing mansard with his proposed addition. Mr. Schaaf countered that, in fact, the applicant is proposing a copy. Mr. D'Alonzo claimed that double-level mansards are common in Paris. He explained that the mansard roof was developed to avoid property taxes in Paris. Mr. Schaaf stated that he has never encountered a double-level mansard in Paris.

Mr. Wilds opined that this building might not be a suitable site for any type of rooftop addition. He asserted that there is no acceptable way to add to this mansard. Mr. D'Alonzo contended that the Commission must allow historic buildings to evolve. He noted that the addition could not be set back from the street façade satisfactorily because the building is on a corner. Mr. Wilds agreed and again stated that this building is not an appropriate site for a rooftop addition. Mr. Sklaroff observed that the Commission often reviews and approves rooftop additions; he noted several approved in Old City. However, he stated that some buildings are not appropriate for additions; he commented that the Commission had denied an addition proposal for the N.W. Ayer building on Washington Square. Mr. Sugrue explained that the Commission had approved additions, but not in this type of context. Mr. Sklaroff remarked that the Commission is consistent when it predicates its reviews on context and not on hard and fast rules.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the proposal, pursuant to Standards 1, 2, 5, and 9 and the Addition Guidelines. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1910 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: Robert D. Harvey

Applicant: Liz Zimmers

History: Built c. 1886. Individually designated on 06/29/1971; Designated as a contributing resource within the Spring Garden Historic District on 10/11/2000

Project: Construct five-story building with underground garage.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, provided the windows and doors are clad, not vinyl; the retaining wall along Nectarine Street is rebuilt in schist; and the bay at 1912 Spring Garden Street is adequately protected; with the staff to review brick samples and other details; pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: The historic resource that stood on this parcel partially collapsed on September 2005 owing to the site excavation at 1904-08 Spring Garden Street. The remaining main block and partial rear ell were declared Imminently Dangerous by the Department of Licenses & Inspections and demolished soon after.

The applicant proposes to construct a five-story building on this parcel. The new building would relate to the newly constructed building at 1904-08 Spring Garden in scale and massing. The proposed building would have a cast stone base, brick upper floors, standing seam mansard with full-width dormer and vinyl windows and doors. The rear facade would be stuccoed. The building would have a partially sunken garage with an entrance from Nectarine Street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal and the Committee recommendation. Liz Zimmers of Zimmers Associates represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff inquired about the accidental demolition of the historic building that stood on this site. Several Commissioners and staff members explained that the historic building had collapsed after contractors erecting a building to the east accidentally undermined the foundation. Mr. Sklaroff asked why the Committee had recommended that clad

windows be substituted for the proposed vinyl windows. Mr. Farnham stated that the Committee was endeavoring to preserve the district, the historic resource in this instance, with the recommendation of the clad windows, which are arguably more appropriate for the district. Ms. Zimmers stated that she accepted the Committee's recommendation.

ACTION: Mr. Riviera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the windows and doors are clad, not vinyl; the retaining wall along Nectarine Street is rebuilt in schist; and the bay at 1912 Spring Garden Street is adequately protected; with the staff to review brick samples and other details; pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

501 S. 33RD STREET (WEIGHTMAN HALL)

Owner: Trustees, University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Richard Russell

History: Built 1924. Designated on 2/7/1974

Project: Replace wood windows with aluminum clad windows.

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the windows at Weightman Hall, University of Pennsylvania. The building retains its original wood true-divided-light windows. The applicant proposes to replace them with Jeld-Wen Custom Collection aluminum-clad units with simulated muntins. The proposed replacement window would copy the dimensions of the original almost exactly, except for a ¼-inch increase on the frame dimension.

DISCUSSION: Messrs. Steinberg and Sugrue recused owing to their affiliations with the university. Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. No one attended to represent the application.

Mr. Wilds asked if the Commission had set a precedent and approved windows of an alternate material in a similar situation. Mr. Baron said that the Commission has a practice of denying replacement windows in alternate materials below the fourth-floor level in large buildings. Mr. Danta noted that some Committee members deemed this application to be a prelude to a later submission for aluminum-clad windows on street facades.

ACTION: Mr. James moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the proposal, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Riviera seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 7 to 0. Messrs. Sklaroff and Wilds abstained. Messrs. Steinberg and Sugrue recused.

113-25 CHURCH STREET

Owner: Church Street Associates

Applicant: Stephen Maffei

History: Designated on 12/12/2003 as non-contributing vacant lots

Project: Construction of six-story building on vacant lot

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee commented that the proposal was compatible with the historic district.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a six-story building on empty parcels in the Old City Historic District. The parcels were parking lots at the time of designation and listed as non-contributing to the district. Therefore, the Commission has 45-day review and comment, not plenary, jurisdiction.

The building would have a ground-floor garage and five stories of residential units. The proposed front façade would have brick veneer at the ground floor and glazing at the upper floors. The façade would be accentuated with exposed concrete and wood-like “Wenge” panels. The side facades would be constructed of concrete with “Wenge” and blue azurite panels. The front facade would include two protruding bays, balconies, and terraces. The massing and scale of the building respects and responds to its surrounding.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Commission. Attorney Michael Mattioni and architect Steven Maffei represented the application

Ms. Merriman stated that the proposed building is “beautiful” and “appropriately scaled.” Mr. Schaaf stated that it is an “exciting counterpoint” to the surrounding historic buildings. Mr. Maffei explained that the proposed building would be set back from Church Street to preserve the views of the Christ Church steeple. Mr. Sugrue commended the project and observed that it is “not slavishly derivative,” like much of the new construction that the Commission reviews.

ACTION: Mr. Tissian moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and comment that the proposal is compatible with the historic district. Mr. Riviera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

505 N. 21ST STREET

Owner: Abraham & Alisha Dubb

Applicant: Emily Freeman

History: Built c. 1855 with c. 1890 additions, designated on 10/11/2000

Project: Rear addition with roof deck, window replacement.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the replacement of the windows with the staff to review muntin configuration and shop drawings; the restoration to the bay with the staff to review details; the stucco on the chimney; and enlargement of ground-floor side openings; pursuant to Standards 6 and 9. One Committee member recommends approval of the proposed dormer and roof deck as submitted. The other Committee member recommends denial of the proposed dormer and roof deck as submitted, but approval of the dormer and roof deck with a narrower opening, with staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace or repair all windows throughout this building. The original building dates from c. 1855, but has two additions dating from the 1890s. The applicant proposes to replace most of the windows with two-over-two true-divided-light wood windows in the 1855 section of the building and clad one-over-one windows in the rear portions of the property. The building currently has various types of windows from different eras. The staff has discovered evidence at the building that leads it to believe that a two-over-two configuration might have not been the original configuration, but rather six-over-six windows with structural plank frames were original. However, further research should be conducted to determine the appropriateness of this configuration.

There is currently a multi-light single door that opens out to the porch along 21st Street, which would be replaced with a more compatible wood door that reflects the configuration of the original floor-to-ceiling window. An exposed CMU chimney in one of the late nineteenth-century additions would be stuccoed.

Along the side elevation, mostly invisible from a public right-of-way, the applicant proposes to alter two openings to accommodate triple sliding glass doors. The applicant also plans to restore a bay window. At the rear of the property, the applicant proposes to construct a roof deck with a dormer-type access, which would have sliding doors. The construction of this dormer would necessitate the removal of a large section of the roof trusses as well as the rear cornice and third-floor wall.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Architects Brett Webber and Josh Adam and owner Alisha Dubb represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff asked the staff to highlight the open questions with the application. Mr. Danta explained that the applicants proposed windows of the correct type and material, but of the wrong muntin pattern. He stated that the windows should be six-over-six. Mr. Webber agreed to install the appropriate six-over-six windows.

Mr. Baron noted that work recently completed at the adjacent twin had not complied with the Commission's approval. He stated that the windows, dormer, and deck were either constructed in a manner that exceeded the Commission's approval or installed without a permit. He reported that the Commission had denied the deck, but it had been built despite the denial.

Mr. Sklaroff asked the architects about the roof deck and dormer. Mr. Webber stated that the top floor of the house is currently unusable. The owners would like to use it. Adding the dormer would render it usable. He claimed that the dormer and deck would be minimally visible. He noted that the cornice brackets are already missing where the dormer would be installed. Mr. Schaaf opined that the illegal dormer on the neighboring twin is better proportioned than the dormer proposed in this application. Mr. Webber stated again that the dormer would not be visible to the public; it is on a private façade. He also noted that the dormer would be clearly new, not falsely historic.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the proposal as submitted, provided the appropriate window configurations are substituted, with the staff to review details including window configurations and shop drawings. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 10 to 1. Mr. Rivera dissented.

218 S. DELHI STREET

Owner: D. Buriak & J. Chandler

Applicant: Alvin Holm

History: Built c. 1830. Designated on 1/31/1961

Project: Roof deck stair enclosure, bathroom addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: The Architectural Committee reviewed an application for a large deck for this property in January 2006. The Committee recommended denial as submitted, but approval of the deck provided that it was placed solely on the rear ell and with a railing height not to exceed three feet above the ridge of the gable. The applicant withdrew the application. A small deck on a newly constructed part of the rear ell and not visible from the street was subsequently approved at the staff level. That approval also met the Committee's recommendation. The deck access approved at that time included a spiral stair on the side.

The applicant now proposes a small bathroom addition, hidden from the public right-of-way. This addition will not involve the demolition of the rear façade. The applicant also proposes to enclose the spiral stair with a penthouse. The deck has not changed in placement or dimensions from the previously approved version.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application and the Committee recommendation to the Commission. Attorney Adam Laver and architect John Devine represented the application.

Mr. Danta stated that a mock up proved that the proposed construction would not be visible from the public right-of-way.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Steinberg seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1214 ARCH STREET (MERSHON BUILDING)

Owner: Clint Swingle

Applicant: Marion Stroud Swingle

History: Designated on 6/13/1990. Milligan & Webber, architects, 1907

Project: Alterations to fourteen-story building

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The member of the Architectural Committee recommended approval, provided that the historic lower transom is removed and double-leaf doors that fill the opening and have glazing and panels like the storefront windows are installed in the front entranceway, and provided that the railings at the rear fire stair are retained and the glazed panels are set behind them; pursuant to Standard 9.

OVERVIEW: The Historical Commission approved an application for significant alterations to this building in February 2006. The building has changed ownership; the new owner proposes to convert the building into gallery space.

The application proposes to restore the front façade of the building along Arch Street, with some minor changes. The storefront currently has a non-historic door with blocked transoms. The applicant proposes to install a double door and reglaze the storefront exposing the original transoms. However, the storefront details appear flawed; some details need refinement.

The application proposes a curtain-wall system, roll-up garage gate, the removal of air conditioning units, and the infill of an open, fire stair with an aluminum glazing system. All these changes would be at the rear façade, which faces an alley.

The application also proposes the addition of two mechanical penthouses on the roof. It proposes to expand an existing penthouse towards the rear of the property and to build an elevator/stair penthouse towards the front of the building. Neither mechanical penthouse would be visible from Arch Street, but they would be visible along the eastern party-wall elevation.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Sklaroff recused owing to his law firm's relationship with the property owner.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Kerry Nolan of Gluckman Mayner Architects and James Karmolinski of Kelly/Maiello Architects represented the application.

Mr. Sugrue asked about a parking sign seen in the photographs. Mr. Wilds explained that it is on the neighboring property to the east.

Mr. Schaaf asserted that the proposed 9'-4" door was too tall and would not function properly. Mr. Steinberg agreed and stated that the historic double-transom should be retained, allowing a shorter door to be installed. Ms. Nolan stated that the owner needed the capability to move large objects through the front doors and therefore needed the additional height; therefore the front doors must be configured to accept freight when the rear is blocked. She stated that Cuthbert Street at the rear is often blocked with delivery trucks. Mr. Wilds agreed that the alley is a "nightmare." Mr. Baron suggested that the lower transom above the door be configured to swing up to allow large objects to pass through the entrance.

Mr. Schaaf asked about the proposal for the rear fire stair. Mr. Baron explained that the Committee recommended setting the new curtain wall back behind the railing to retain the historic spatial relationships.

Mr. Steinberg returned to the question of the front double transom over the door. He asserted that the historic double transom should be retained. Ms. Merriman countered that she deemed the removal of the lower of the two historic transoms acceptable.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the proposal, provided that the historic lower transom is removed and double-leaf doors that fill the opening and have glazing and panels like the storefront windows are installed in the front entranceway, and provided that the railings at the rear fire stair are retained and the glazed panels are set behind them; pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Wilds seconded the motion, which passed with a vote of 9 to 1. Mr. Sklaroff recused. Mr. Steinberg opposed.

3801 MOUNT PLEASANT DRIVE, ROCKLAND MANSION

Owner: City of Philadelphia

History: Built c. 1800, designated 5/31/1960

Applicant: Tom McPoyle

Project: Add new door hood at side elevation

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of a door hood with a simple shed shape, closed sides, metal supporting brackets, and a flat-seam metal roof.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add a hipped-roof door hood over a basement level entrance on the east elevation of Rockland Mansion. The hood would be supported by two brackets and roofed with gray asphalt shingles. The hood would extend about four feet from the building and under two feet above the door. At its widest the hood would measure about six feet.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application.

ACTION: Mr. Steinberg moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the revised design showing a door hood with a simple shed shape, closed sides, metal supporting brackets, and a flat-seam metal roof. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

653 N. 16th Street

Owner/Applicant: Jun Kang

History: Vacant lot with in the Spring Garden Historic District

Project: Construct of four-story single family dwelling

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to comment that garages are not appropriate for the front facades of rowhouses in historic districts and that, if the applicant retains the garage despite the objection, the garage door should be faced with panels, not vertical boards.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story residence on a vacant lot within the Spring Garden Historic District. The lot sits between a c. 1853 Greek Revival church and a c. 1875 Italianate Rowhouse. The building would be constructed of red brick. The first floor of the front façade would hold the main entrance, with a six-panel door and transom, and a garage. A two-story bay would span the second and third floors over the garage entrance. The bay would have four two-over-two windows one each floor. Two two-over-two windows would be placed at the second and third story levels over the main entrance. A fiberglass cornice would cap the front elevation. The fourth floor is set back from the façade and will not be visible from the street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Brian McAllister of Cubit Real Estate, Inc. represented the application.

Mr. McAllister stated that he had worked diligently to develop a design that the Spring Garden Civic Association would support. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the applicant had received his zoning approval. Mr. McAllister stated that he had been issued a zoning approval.

Mr. Wilds objected to the garage and asked about the current requirements for garages. Mr. Perri noted that the City recently adopted a new parking district law. Mr. Tissian asked for details. Mr. Perri explained that off-street parking was no longer required, but, instead, off-street parking now required a variance. Mr. McAllister stated that he both needed and wanted off-street parking. Mr. Schaaf reported that the City Planning Commission is considering legislation that would require a room with a window or door at the first-floor front. Mr. Sklaroff noted that the bay was not appropriately proportioned because of the garage. Mr. Steinberg stated that it was unfortunate to give this façade away to the automobile. He also claimed that it was too historical and should be more contemporary. Mr. Rivera suggested that the developer adjust the proportions and lower the bay.

Ms. Murray raised the issue of parking again, asserting that the new parking legislation was more complex than already stated. Attorney Stephen Pollack stepped forward and read from the City's new parking law.

ACTION: Mr. Rivera moved to adopt the comments of the Architectural Committee, which stated that garages are not appropriate for the front facades of rowhouses in historic districts and that, if the applicant retains the garage despite the objection, the garage door should be faced with panels, not vertical boards. Ms. Murray seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

250 S. 16TH STREET (HANNAH PENN REPUBLICAN HOUSE)

Owner: Eisenhower Exchange Fellowships

Applicant: Stephanie Gropp

History: Built 1903, T. M. Rogers, Architect, Designated individually, 6/7/1973, and contributing within the Rittenhouse Fittler Residential Historic District.

Project: New openings along partywall

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to create five new openings for windows and to replace existing fire escape doors with fire rated ceramic glazed doors along the south party wall. Three of the new windows will be one-over-one fire rated steel windows, two on the second floor and one on the third floor. The two other openings will be to decorative arched windows with applied muntins. The new windows are to be located towards the rear of the building with minimal, if any, visibility from the street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Architect Peter Goldring represented the application.

Mr. Perri noted that the proposed windows would require a variance from the Board of Building Standards. Mr. Schaaf claimed that the proposed fan-shaped window would be difficult to cut into the brick wall. Mr. Goldring agreed.

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

221 S. JESSUP STREET

Owner/Applicant: Modesto Bigas-Valedon and Julie Seda-Agrait

History: Built 1814, Designated 2/28/1961

Project: Alter non-historic openings at rear ell

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alter non-historic openings of the rear ell. It proposes to remove an existing wall mounted air conditioning unit on the east façade and second floor of the ell and create a new opening for a new casement window to match the existing casements on the south façade of the ell. The bricks removed to create the opening will be relocated in the existing opening of the air conditioning unit and at the sides of the two proposed casement windows on the first floor. The proposed casements on the first floor would be replacing the two non-historic jalousie windows.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Owner Modesto Bigas-Valedon stated that, after much discussion with his wife, they had decided to change the proposed casements to double-hung windows for safety reasons.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue moved to adopt the proposal with double-hung windows in place of the casement windows, with the staff to review details. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

112 CUTHBERT STREET

Owner/Applicant: T. T. Newbold and Helen Cunningham

History: Built c. 1760, designated individually 04/09/1957; significant to the Old City Historic District 12/12/2003

Project: Construct rear two-story addition

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story addition located at the rear of the historic building and to the side of an existing addition. It proposes to extend the slope of the roof of the existing addition and add a dormer with double six-over-six windows. The addition would be constructed of new CMU block with stucco. The dormer and portions of the rear of the proposed addition would be clad in wood siding. The applicants propose a four-over-four window on the first floor and a French door and sidelight with an ironwork railing on the second floor for the north elevation of the addition. They propose dormer windows and a French door with sidelight and transom on the first floor for the east elevation. No openings are proposed for the south elevation of the addition.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Owners Ted Newbold and Helen Cunningham represented the application. Mr. Schaaf asked about the objects mounted on the walls of the complex. Mr. Newbold explained that they are pieces from his collection of architectural artifacts.

ACTION: Ms. Murray 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.

309 N. 3RD STREET

Owner/Applicant: Brian Szymanik

History: Built c. 1855, designated individually 12/31/1984; contributing to the Old City Historic District 12/12/2003

Project: roof deck, rear balconies

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to add new doors and windows in the existing opening at the fourth-story rear of the building. Also at the fourth floor a new steel balcony is proposed to replace an existing concrete ramp spanning Bodine Street. This application proposes to enlarge the existing door opening at the fifth-floor rear of the building to accommodate a new door and window. A new steel balcony is proposed to replace an existing steel balcony. Also at this level, the application proposes to add a spiral stair within an existing abandoned elevator shaft to access the proposed roof deck. The elevator penthouse would be extended approximately four feet with brick to accommodate for the spiral stair. The proposed roof deck would measure approximately 16 by 18 feet and would not be visible from any public right-of-way.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission.

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

OLD BUSINESS

1537 PINE STREET

Owner: 200 Christian Street Partners

Applicant: Harman Deutsch

History: Built c. 1865. Designation Contributing, Rittenhouse-Fitler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Rear alterations, Fourth floor terrace

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to the rear of this four-story Italianate rowhouse. At the first floor, the proposal includes shifting the rear entrance from the east bay to a centered position in the façade with French doors, flanked on both sides with fixed French doors. Transoms would top the entire width of the French doors. A wrought iron terrace and railing with metal steps is proposed to access the rear entry way. At the second-floor level, French doors with transoms would be installed, enlarging the existing

masonry openings. The doors would be similar in design to the existing rear door. A wrought iron balcony and railing would be installed on the second-floor level serving both proposed doors. At the the third floor, window sashes are proposed using the existing frames. These windows would be six-over-six, simulated-divided-light windows. On the fourth floor, a terraced is proposed; it would involve removing a rear portion of the roof and the brick and wood facade at the fourth floor. A wrought iron railing would span the opening. The existing cornice would remain. French doors would be added approximately 14 feet from the rear façade, creating a new fourth-floor rear façade and providing access to the terrace from the interior of the building.

This application also proposes masonry repointing and cleaing, and windows for the front façade of the building. A one-over-one, true-divided-light sash kit on the first floor, two, two-over-two, true-divided-light sash kits on the second floor, and four two-over-two simulated-divided-light sash kits on the third and fourth floors, are proposed.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal. Attorney Stephen Pollock, architects Craig Deutsch and Paul Drzal, and developer Virgil Proccacino represented the application.

Mr. Pollack stated that all alterations are proposed for the rear of the building. He noted a visibility study prepared by Mr. Deutsch that proved that the changes would not be visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Baron stated that that alley is open to the public and the rear is visible from it. Mr. Wilds responded that it is a narrow, private alley with little or no access. He asserted that this review should have been conducted at the staff level and should not have been forwarded to the Commission. Mr. Baron stated that this row has mostly intact rear facades and that its significance is more important than the visibility.

MOTION: Mr. Wilds moved to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Murray seconded.

Mr. James asked if the application proposed any alterations to the front facade. Mr. Deutsch responded that his plans did not propose any changes for the front façade; all of the alterations would take place at the rear. Mr. James asked him to confirm his statement. Mr. Deutsch replied that all work proposed was located at the rear, not the front. Mr. Baron and Mr. Danta noted that Mr. Deutsch's architectural plans indicate that simulated-divided-light windows were proposed for the front façade. Several Commissioners asked Mr. Deutsch to clarify his earlier statement that he was proposing no work for the front façade. Mr. Deutsch conceded that his plans did call for simulated-divided-light windows at the front façade. He stated that he would amend his plans to specify wood, true-divided-light windows at the front façade.

ACTION: Mr. Wilds and Ms. Murray amended their motion to approve the application, provided the historically appropriate wood true-divided-light windows are installed at the front façade, with the staff to review details. The Commission voted unanimously to approve the amended motion. Mr. Sklaroff recused.

The Commission recessed briefly. When they reconvened, Commissioner Sugrue served as the Acting Chair in the absence of Mr. Sklaroff, who had recused owing to his law firm's involvement with the application. The Commission included Commissioners

James, Merriman, Murray, Perri, Schaaf, Steinberg, Tissian, and Wilds with Acting Chair Sugrue.

223-225 S. 6TH STREET, DILWORTH HOUSE

Owner: John J. and Mary Elizabeth Turchi

Applicant: Neil Sklaroff, Esq.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In parallel with the initial in-concept application, the applicant proposed the reclassification of the property from a significant property to a non-contributing building and a contributing site. The Committee on Historic Designation reviewed the reclassification application in July 2005 and recommended denial of the application and the reaffirmation of the significant classification. The Commission continued the reclassification application and has not yet reviewed it. The applicant now requests that

that “the Historical Commission postpone consideration of that [reclassification] request pending its decision on our current application for final approval.”

The current application proposes to retain much of the historic building. However, it proposes to demolish both the two-story stair tower and one- and two-story rear wing. The stair tower faces Washington Square. The rear wing is visible from Randolph Street.

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

Putting aside the question of demolition momentarily, the architectural merits of the new construction must be addressed. The Commission must determine whether the mid-rise building is compatible in size, scale, proportion, and massing with the remaining section of the historic building and the surrounding historic district.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Commission. Architects Robert Venturi and Carey Yonce of Venturi Scott Brown Associates, engineer Constantine Dukakis of Keast & Hood Co., attorney Neil Sklaroff, Esq., of Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll, LLP, consultants G. Craig Schelter of Schelter & Associates and George Thomas of Civic Visions, LP, and property owner John Turchi of Turchi Properties represented the application.

Mr. Sugrue established the terms of the discussion. He stated that each side would be granted 30 minutes to make its case. Mr. Sklaroff stated that he would endeavor to comply with the 30-minute time limit, but may exceed it.

Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Farnham what percentage of this building would be demolished if the proposal were approved. Mr. Farnham explained that his staff did not have sufficient information to determine how much square footage on all floors within the historic building would be demolished and preserved, but it was able to calculate the percentage of overall building footprint that would be lost with the demolition. He stated that, in these terms, 48% would be demolished. Mr. Wilds noted that the Commission had approved a plan to rehabilitate this building in 2003; he asked if the Commission approved the demolition of the same fabric that is now proposed for demolition. Mr. Farnham explained that in 2003 the Commission approved a project for the current owner that included the demolition of the one- and two-story rear or east wing. In 2003, the applicant did not request nor did the Commission approve the demolition of the north wing or stair tower, the section that fronts onto Washington Square and runs north from the main block of the building to the south party wall of the Athenaeum. Mr. Sugrue asked how much more demolition is requested now than was approved in 2003. Mr. Farnham stated that he did not have an exact number, but opined that a large percent of the currently proposed demolition was already approved in 2003. Mr. Wilds asked if 80% or 90% of the demolition now requested has already been approved. Mr. Farnham disagreed and suggested that the number was lower, perhaps 75%. He offered to have the staff perform that calculation quickly. Mr. Schelter stated that the footprint of the stair tower is 120 square feet; the rear wing is 867 square feet. Mr. Sugrue suggested that the stair tower occupies approximately 12% of the footprint of the section currently proposed for demolition. He remarked that the Commission must determine whether the additional demolition now proposed would cross the line and be construed as a “demolition in significant part.” Mr. Copeland commented that the Commission may not have

addressed the question of significant demolition in its deliberations in 2003. He stated that, as a legal matter, he does not believe that the Commission established a precedent regarding the significant-insignificant demolition issue with its 2003 decision. He suggested that the Commission consider the current application and its demolition component on its own merits. Mr. Sugrue agreed and stated that the Commission must determine whether the demolition of 48% of the building constitutes a “demolition in significant part.” Mr. Schaaf reminded everyone that the 48% refers to the footprint, not the square footage of the entire house. Mr. Steinberg asked Mr. Copeland if the Rules & Regulations provide guidance for the interpretation of “demolition in significant part.” Mr. Copeland replied “not really.” He quoted the demolition definition in the ordinance. He noted that the second sentence in the definition provides “some sense of the degree of removal” necessary to constitute “demolition in significant part.” Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Copeland if he perceived “façade” and “surface” as the key words. Mr. Copeland replied that he did; “removal of the façade or surface is demolition.” Mr. Sugrue stated that neither the interior volume nor the footprint is the appropriate measure; it is façade or surface. Mr. Copeland opined that the percentage of demolition might not be relevant. Mr. Steinberg stated that the ordinance and Rules provide “no real guidance.” Mr. Copeland added: “no real guidance except ‘in significant part’.” Mr. James asked if any of the terminology related to demolition is defined in the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards. Mr. Farnham stated that he knew of no definition of “significant demolition” within the Standards or Guidelines.

Mr. Steinberg asked if the Commission wanted to consider the demolition now or postpone the discussion until after the presentations. Mr. Copeland suggested that the Commission might be guided by earlier determinations of “demolition in significant part.” Mr. Steinberg asked for examples. Mr. Tissian asked why the Commission was ignoring the new construction. Mr. Sugrue stated that the Commission would discuss it. Mr. Steinberg asked if the demolition at York Row was considered significant. Mr. Wilds replied that the Commission did not consider the “significant demolition” question, but approved the proposal as an acceptable alteration and addition. Mr. Steinberg suggested that the Commission settle the demolition issue before moving to the new construction. He stated that he did not consider the demolition to be significant; he noted that “the bulk of the house would remain.”

MOTION: Mr. Steinberg moved to find that the proposed demolition is not a “demolition in significant part.” Ms. Merriman seconded the motion.

Mr. Sugrue requested that the speakers address the demolition only and not the new construction at this point in the discussion.

Mr. Sklaroff noted that almost all of the proposed demolition was already approved in 2003. He also noted that the staff and Architectural Committee have asserted that the new construction that will replace the demolished fabric is not germane to the assessment of the demolition. He stated that the conditions that allowed the Commission to approve the demolition of the rear wing in 2003 have persisted to today; therefore, the only demolition in question at this point in time is the 120 square feet of the north wing or stair tower. He clarified that this area is actually a servants’ ell. He explained that he will call experts to discuss the materials, architecture, and other aspects of the wing; they will demonstrate that it is not a significant section of the building. He also explained that demolition must occur to repair the south wall of the Athenaeum, which is “crumbling” and “in significant jeopardy.” The engineers need “a clear view” of the Athenaeum wall to

repair it. He concluded, stating that the many aspects of the application are intertwined; the demolition cannot be entirely separated from other aspects of the project.

Mr. Sklaroff introduced engineer Constantine Doukakis of Keast & Hood Co.

Larry Silver, the attorney for the Society Hill Civic Association and Preservation Alliance, objected to the introduction of new witnesses and documents. He claimed that the introduction violated the Commission's Rules & Regulations because nothing related to this witness and his testimony had been submitted to the Commission seven days in advance. He reported that he had received no notice that this witness would testify. Mr. Sklaroff countered that this information had been submitted in 2005. Also, he noted that Mr. Silver had, in writing to the Commission on September 3, reserved the right to call additional witnesses beyond those cited in his letter. Mr. Copeland observed that the Commission has often waived the "substantial testimony" submission requirement and heard new testimony at its discretion. Ms. Merriman exclaimed that she would like to hear the new testimony from Mr. Sklaroff's witness. Mr. Sugrue informally polled the Commission members regarding the presentation of new testimony; no Commissioners objected.

Mr. Doukakis introduced the Commission to the party wall and stair tower wing. He asserted that the demolition of the buildings to create the lot for the Dilworth House in 1956 destabilized the south wall of the Athenaeum. He stated that the wall is unstable and is bowing and cracking. He remarked that the stair tower of the Dilworth House does not support the party wall. When Mr. Sugrue asked if the demolition of the stair tower was necessary to stabilize the party wall, Mr. Doukakis replied in the affirmative. Mr. Sugrue then asked him if there are ways to shore the Athenaeum party wall without demolishing the stair tower. Mr. Doukakis stated that he could not assure the Athenaeum that the problem had been solved without demolishing the stair tower of the Dilworth House. He explained a tie-back system that he would like to install. He concluded that the "demolition will facilitate" the reinforcement of the Athenaeum.

Mr. Sklaroff introduced Roger Moss, the Executive Director of the Athenaeum. Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Moss if he considered the demolition of the Dilworth stair tower to constitute "demolition in significant part." Mr. Moss replied that he did not consider the stair tower to be a significant part of the building. Mr. Sugrue urged him to elaborate. He stated that the political issues had distorted the "key questions." The Athenaeum has opposed the Dilworth House from the beginning. Mr. Moss conceded that he is prejudiced and asserted that he does not believe that the Dilworth House is a significant building. Mr. Sugrue asked him to explain. Mr. Moss stated that the back half of the building is a service area. He stated that the "hyphen" or stair tower is not significant, if one considers the eighteenth-century architecture from which G. Edwin Brumbaugh drew his inspiration. Mr. Moss opined that the main, core block should be saved. He continued, stating that the stair tower contains toilets, closets, and a small stair. He added that the stair tower is set back and not very visible. He contended that the Athenaeum is much more important than the Dilworth House. It is a National Historic Landmark. He concluded, asking which was more important, the National Historic Landmark or a couple of toilets.

Mr. Sklaroff introduced G. Craig Schelter, who asserted that, of the 87 feet of the main façade, only 12 feet would be demolished. He testified that the owner would give an easement to the Preservation Alliance to protect the surviving façade. If measured in

square feet, 90% of the primary façade would be preserved.

Mr. Sklaroff introduced cultural historian George Thomas. Mr. Thomas stated that this proposal “leaves the significant part [of the building] intact.” He asserted that the “principal affect, the means by which people describe the building, is this brick frontal block on which Brumbaugh devoted his principal historicizing labors and in which he placed his principal architectural quotations from the Morris House around the corner.” Brumbaugh does not mention the additions in his discussions of the building, Mr. Thomas asserted; therefore, they are less significant. They were stuck to the side of the building to solve modern problems. Also, the main facades are brick with detailing; the secondary facades on the service core are stucco. Mr. Thomas displayed drawings by Brumbaugh to demonstrate that the architect considered the stair tower to be less significant. Mr. Thomas asserted that the sculptural main block is critical, but the stucco portions are not. He also noted the “syncopation” on 6th Street: Athenaeum, void, Dilworth, void, Lippincott. Mr. Thomas stated that he is a Frank Furness scholar and noted that the Commission approved the demolition of the Furness banking room at the PSFS building without finding it significant. He also pointed to the fact that the Commission did not require a finding of hardship or public interest when it approved the demolition of the rears of the York Row buildings. Ms. Murray asked Mr. Thomas if the stair tower was a “character-defining feature.” Mr. Thomas stated that it was not.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance addressed the Commission. He claimed that the demolition now proposed is “in significant part.” He stated that the 2003 decision regarding the application to alter this property was irrelevant to the current discussion. He stated that there is no clear precedent. He distributed a chart defining demolition and alteration. He stated that this application did not propose alteration. When a building is altered, the use remains the same. Repair, restoration, and renovation are alteration; use remains the same. When a building is adaptively reused, also a type of alteration, the use changes, but the exterior does not change much. This application proposes neither renovation nor adaptive reuse. This is a demolition, not alteration.

Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Gallery to comment on the PSFS and York Row examples. Mr. Gallery stated that the Commission was negligent in those cases. He also noted that the buildings were in poor condition and the Commission entered into a deal to save the most important sections of them. He stated that a financial hardship application should have been required, but was not; however, he believes that if one had been required, it is highly likely that it would have been approved. The Commission made a deal to preserve the major parts of the historic building. Yet, it was, in fact, a demolition in significant part. There are no mitigating conditions in the Dilworth House case. He observed that the Athenaeum has had these alleged structural problems for 50 years and nothing has been done about them. Now, when it is convenient, they are used as the justification for the demolition of a historically significant building. Mr. Gallery asserted that it is not appropriate to demolish one historic building to undertake maintenance on another.

Mr. James asked Mr. Gallery why it is important to save this part of the building. Mr. Gallery replied that he would address that in his statement.

Mr. Gallery referred to Park Mall at Temple University. He reported that the Commission found that the proposed work was a demolition, not an alteration. It therefore required a hardship application. Ultimately, the Commission determined that it would be financially

infeasible to require the adaptive reuse of the buildings. He suggested that the Commission should follow the same path in the Dilworth case and require the submission of a hardship application.

Mr. Gallery asserted that the ordinance does not define demolition as “demolition of the most significant part,” but as “demolition in whole or significant part.” He asserted that the demolition of 48% of the footprint was significant. He noted that when the proposed sections of the building are demolished, the remaining building would be nothing but a shell; it will have no bathroom or stairs. The critical, functional pieces of the house will be removed. He contended that the Commission had decided that the preservation of the stair hall was critical in 2003. He added that the rear wing is Modern; it is the part of the building that tells the observer that the building was erected in the 1950s. He asserted that the rear wing tells an important part of the historical narrative of this house. He read from the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and claimed that this is a significant demolition when evaluated with the Standards. The Standards say that this is a demolition. Mr. Tissian asked if the upper floors would be accessible after the demolition. Mr. Gallery stated that there would be no access to the upper floors. Mr. Yonce of Venturi Scott Brown agreed that if the stair tower is demolished there would be no other access to the upper floors. Mr. Turchi stated that his architect was incorrect. He explained that there is an elevator to the second floor and then a stair from the second to the fourth floor. He added that he would use the building as his office.

Mr. Sugrue asked if Mr. Gallery would consider the use of the upper floors as Mr. Turchi’s office as an adaptive reuse. Mr. Gallery stated that adaptive reuse does not include this degree of demolition. Mr. Gallery contended that the Commission has never approved a project with this much demolition and categorized it as “adaptive reuse.” He asserted that the Commission must be consistent. Mr. James countered that adaptive reuse often includes demolition. Mr. Gallery again reminded the Commission that the ordinance does not say “most significant”; it says “in significant part.” Mr. James remarked that the Commission must have the capacity to exercise its discretion. Mr. James noted that one runs the risk of becoming a “purist” who is “locked into a position” and does not allow buildings to change with time. Mr. James noted that Mr. Gallery was inconsistent: he observed that Mr. Gallery asked the Commission to ignore the 2003 approval when cited by the applicants and yet uses the 2003 approval in his argument. Mr. Gallery concluded, stating that the Commission must use precedent as a guideline. He stated that there is nothing close to a precedent for an approval of a demolition like the one proposed, “nothing in the same galaxy.”

Mr. Wilds referred to the house at 302-304 Gaskill Street. The Commission approved the demolition of the rear ell, rear wall, party wall, and part of the roof. Mr. Gallery noted that the Commission did not approve the first application for that property and that the applicant later returned to the Commission with a much more appropriate application with less demolition, which the Commission approved. Mr. Wilds observed that the demolition was “within our range of discretion.”

Mr. Tissian asked if the wall of the Athenaeum could be repaired in a way that would not require the demolition. Mr. Sugrue objected to the question, stating that it was not germane to the motion.

Mr. Schaaf asked if the Commissioners considered the reconstruction of the so-called Letitia Penn House in Fairmount Park a demolition. Mr. Gallery stated that only

precedent under the Commission's current ordinance was relevant.

Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association addressed the Commission. He stated that the Commission itself declared that York Row should not be considered precedent-setting. He read from the Commission's approval letter for the project: "This decision is particular to this development and sets no precedent for the assessment of future developments." He also opined that, if the Athenaeum is really in jeopardy, the side wing of the Dilworth House could be dismantled, the Athenaeum repaired, and the side wing rebuilt. He also asserted that the Dilworths did not use the side wing as a service quarters. Mr. Boni referred to a statement by Chairman Michael Sklaroff, in which he noted the Commission's practice of approving the demolition of rear ells on residential buildings. Mr. Boni argued that this is not the case here. This owner is not replacing one rear ell with another to make his house more livable. However, that is exactly what he proposed and the Commission approved in 2003. Joanne Phillips, Mr. Turchi's attorney at the time, described it exactly as such, the replacement of one wing with another. She referred to it as an alteration that would have returned the building to its original use. Mr. Boni also quoted from statements uttered by Commissioners during the 2003 review. Mr. Wilds stated: "My primary concern will be what will be visible from Washington Square and what will be the impact on Washington Square." Mr. Sugrue stated: "I think that's highly visible." Mr. Steinberg called the proposal "a bloated addition." Mr. Boni asserted that the Commission's primary concern in 2003 was the visibility from Washington Square. During the 2003 review, the owner made concessions to eliminate visibility from the Square.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that, according to the ordinance, demolitions that are not "in significant part" are alterations. He asserted that this proposed demolition is not "significant." Everything not "in significant part" is an alteration.

Mr. Schelter stated that 1730 square feet would be demolished and 2352 square would be retained. The stair wing is 240 square feet. He asserted that 42% of the building would be demolished. The stair wing is 5% of the building. He explained that a person walking at 5 m.p.h. past the 12 feet of the stair wing façade would see the façade for 1.5 seconds. He concluded that no one but an architectural historian would notice this wing.

Mr. Tissian stated that the decision the Commission made in 2003 is not entirely relevant; he asserted that the Commission must make its decisions within contexts, not in vacuums; it must look at the merits of today's proposal. Mr. Steinberg stated that the Commission must be informed by, but not bound by, earlier decisions. Mr. James stated that precedent should not restrain the Commission. Mr. Sugrue posited that the Commission must review on a case-by-case basis. Ms. Murray asserted that this is not significant demolition. Mr. Steinberg agreed, stated that the remaining piece would be significant, but the wing is not. However, he cautioned the Commission against façadectomies. Mr. Tissian suggested rhetorically that this "insignificant" demolition would devastate the "significant" building.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue called for a vote on the motion offered by Mr. Steinberg and Ms. Merriman to find that the proposed demolition is not a "demolition in significant part." The motion carried by a vote of 9 to 1. Mses. Merriman and Murray and Messrs. James, Perri, Rivera, Schaaf, Steinberg, Sugrue, and Wilds voted affirmatively. Mr. Tissian dissented.

Mr. Sugrue called upon the applicants to present their in-concept application for the new construction. Mr. Venturi spoke about the relation of the proposed building to its context, the complex and contradictory Washington Square. He described it as a medium-rise building. He observed that it would cantilever slightly over the historic building, acknowledging the older building. He explained that the proposed materials would relate to the surrounding buildings. He remarked that Washington Square is fascinatingly complex.

Mr. Yonce stated that the new building would be 16 stories and enclose 66,000 square feet. He noted that the entrance is located where the stair tower now stands. Mr. Schaaf asked him to comment on the treatment of the party wall at the Athenaeum. Mr. Yonce stated that he had not yet worked out the details of that wall. Mr. Sklaroff interjected that Mr. Turchi has made a commitment to fix the Athenaeum's wall and preserve its light and air. Mr. Wilds commented that the architects should rethink the cladding on the Athenaeum wall. He noted that this is a design issue that must be resolved. Mr. Yonce displayed drawings documented the updated, now-articulated, south party wall. He stated that the side and rear facades will be brick. Mr. Tissian asked about the parking. Mr. Yonce explained that the parking will house 12 automobiles for the 12 units. Mr. Venturi added that the setbacks at the rear are like rear ells on traditional Philadelphia rowhouses. Mr. Sugrue asked the architects why they did not add more openings on the south wall. Mr. Yonce stated that he avoids placing windows in party walls. Also, the elevators and stairs reside behind the south wall. Mr. Schelter stated that the construction of this building would be a win-win situation for all involved. He asserted that this project is "the absolute essence" of Society Hill as conceived by Richardson Dilworth and Ed Bacon. He listed the concessions and commitments that Mr. Turchi had made to the community, the Councilman, and others including safeguards during construction and staging, delaying any demolition until the developer is ready to commence construction, a contribution of \$25,000 for the improvement and beautification of Washington Square, the use of the ground floor of the house for monthly community meetings, preservation easement of the Dilworth House held by the Preservation Alliance, relocation and renovation of the Dilworth Memorial and the section of the fence with "RD," the submission of the final design to the Historical Commission on a timely basis, and the redesign of the south wall.

MOTION: Mr. Steinberg moved to approve the application in concept as documented in the revised plans presented to the Commission at its 8 September 2006 meeting. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion.

Mr. Gallery thanked Mr. Turchi for listening to the interested parties and Mr. Venturi for revising the design in response to community concerns. He asserted that, despite the revisions, one aspect of the design still needs significant revision. The expansive south wall, which is not much better than those at the Beaumont, cannot be improved with minor modifications. The concept itself is deficient. He contends that the plan should be flipped, relocating the recessed, fenestrated, side wall to the south. He reminded that Commissioners that the regulatory agency is responsible for protecting the historic district.

Mr. Boni addressed the Commission. He asked if the "earlier materials" were considered part of the record. Mr. Boni's question confused the Commissioners. They responded that their meetings are not formal hearings; they can consider all materials presented to the Commission. Mr. Sugrue asked Mr. Reuter to clarify the response to Mr. Boni's

question. Mr. Reuter stated that all materials submitted to the Commission for the review of the various Dilworth applications are a matter of public record. Mr. Boni then reminded the Commission of its responsibility to the city and its historic fabric. He contended that Richardson Dilworth was the greatest Philadelphia leader and reformer of the twentieth century; he cautioned the Commissioners that they are “the inheritors of Dilworth’s mantel.”

Carl Primavera, an attorney with Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzburg & Ellers, stepped forward and explained that he represents a group of near neighbors opposed to the size and design of the tower.

Mr. Primavera introduced Arthur Karafin, a resident and representative of the Lippincott Building, the property to the south of the subject property. Mr. Karafin listed several objections to the development: the tower would block the north windows in his building; it would limit the sunlight shining on his building; the construction and subsequent traffic from the new residents would block his parking entrance; the construction of the new tower would disrupt the neighbor and block 6th Street; and the proposed building is not appropriate for the site.

Mr. Primavera then introduced Stephanie Resnick, a resident and representative of Independence Place, which is south of the development site. She stated that the development would negatively impact life around the square; it would “materially, negatively” impact the lives of the residents. She stated that Independence Place has a large open plaza appropriate for the large buildings; the Dilworth tower would be squeezed onto a small lot. Also, the Dilworth lot is currently unkempt. She noted that Brumbaugh designed the features in Washington Square, which are consistent with the Dilworth House; the new tower would disrupt the consistency. She concluded that the tower would destroy the neighborhood for 12 new households.

Mr. Primavera then introduced Leanne Litkin, a resident and representative of St. James Court, which is located adjacent to the Dilworth site, to the east across Randolph Street. She explained that St. James Court is a 44-unit, 2-story residential development. She asserted that the residents of St. James Court would be negatively impacted. Randolph Street, which is very narrow and is a “lifeline” to her development, would become very congested. She concluded that the proposed Turchi development would not be compatible with the existing neighborhood. Mr. Wilds noted that the Turchi development would only include 12 parking spaces. Responding to Ms. Resnick’s testimony, he observed that the neighbors probably objected to Independence Place when it was proposed.

Mr. Tissian explained that he moved to an historic house in Society Hill 50 years ago. He exclaimed the importance of Richardson Dilworth to the community and claimed that Mr. Turchi is “bastardizing” the home of the reformer. He asserted that Mr. Turchi is destroying the symbolic meaning of the house with his luxury condominium project. Mr. Steinberg disagreed and suggested that the project would “elevate the importance of the house.” He applauded the submission and asserted that the project will become better and better as the plans are refined. He contended that the revised plans are “already light years better.” Mr. Rivera stated that he would like to review an alternate design for the south party wall, which can be improved. Mr. James agreed and opined that Mr. Gallery’s suggestions were worthy of consideration. Mr. Steinberg concurred, stating that flipping the plan is a very interesting proposal. However, he noted, Mr. Venturi is the

most qualified architect in the world to address the blank wall.

ACTION: Mr. Sugrue called for a vote on the motion offered by Mr. Steinberg and Mr. Schaaf to approve the application in concept as documented in the revised plans presented to the Commission at its 8 September 2006 meeting. The motion carried with a vote of 9 to 0. Mses. Merriman and Murray and Messrs. James, Perri, Rivera, Schaaf, Steinberg, Sugrue, and Wilds voted to approve. Mr. Tissian abstained.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: At 2:40 p.m., Mr. James moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Rivera seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 1:

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

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

Standard 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.

Addition Guidelines: Recommended: Constructing a new addition so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that the character defining features are not obscured, damaged or destroyed.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Farnham, Randal Baron, and Jorge Danta