

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

**VINCENT RIVERA, CHAIR
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
28 FEBRUARY 2006**

PRESENT

Vincent Rivera, AIA, Chair
Herbert Levy, FAIA
Robert Thomas, AIA
Daniela Voith, AIA
Daniel McCoubrey, AIA
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Thomas Witt, Esq., Wolf Block Schorr & Solis-Cohen
David Ertz, Cope Linder
John Bushnell, Cope Linder
Lenore Millhollen, Preservation Alliance
Joseph Zuritsky, Parkway Corporation
Liz Blazeovich, Preservation Alliance
Forrest Gearhart, Parkway Corporation
Lydia Grose, SEPTA
Anthony Bohara, SEPTA
Stephen Wagner, University City Historical Society
Gihon Jordan, NL
Robert Volpe, LP
Edward Bell, EBA
Hugh Zimmers, Zimmers Associates
Mike Hardy, UCHS
Jim Muell, WMP
Maria Leuzzi
Monica Malpass
Alex Terzich, LTD Architects
Jessica Burns
Bernice Hamel, SHCA
Rebecca Stolloff, SHCA
Brett Webber, Brett Webber Architects
Aaron Childs, KSTOCK 2028 F
D. Haviland, Kline and Specter
Mark Focht, Fairmount Park Commission
Stephanie Craighead, Fairmount Park Commission
Theresa Stuhlman, Fairmount Park Commission
Steven A. Weixler, SHCA

Neil Sklaroff, Esq., Ballard Spahr Ingersoll & Andrews
John Turchi, Turchi Properties
Craig Shelter, Shelter & Associates
Paul Boni, SHCA
Larry Silver, Esq., SHCA
Matt McClure, Ballard Spahr Ingersoll & Andrews
Carey Jackson Yonce, Venturi Scott Brown & Associates
Robert Venturi, VSBA
Matt Conti, VSBA

CALL TO ORDER:

The Committee, which included Robert Thomas, Daniela Voith, Daniel McCoubrey, and Suzanne Pentz, called the meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. The Committee selected Robert Thomas as its acting chair.

1700-1708 RITTENHOUSE SQUARE STREET

Owners: Parkway Corporation, Scannapieco Development Corp.

Applicant: Thomas Witt, Esq.

History: 1700-1704, vacant lot at designation
1706, non-contributing building demolished in 2005
1708, rowhouse, c. 1850

Project: Erect 31-story residential building

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a 31-story residential building on the vacant lot at 1700-1706 Rittenhouse Square Street. The Commission reviewed and approved a proposal for a similar building on this site in December 2004. Nearby residents appealed the zoning approval of the design approved by the Commission. The developers and neighbors settled the appeal; the settlement included the stipulation that the building be redesigned, shifting it to the west.

The current application proposes a 31-story building at the western edge of the lot. A garden would occupy the eastern portion of the lot along 17th Street. To recover some of the floor space lost with the shift, the tower would cantilever out over the historic rowhouse to the west. The tower itself would cantilever four feet out over the three-story building to the west; balconies would cantilever an additional five feet.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Commission's approval of December 2004.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Thomas Witt, architect David Ertz, and developer Joseph Zuritsky represented the application.

Mr. Witt opened the discussion, stating that the tower had been shifted 33 feet to the west to settle a zoning appeal. Mr. Ertz provided an overview of the revised project. Ms. Voith asked if the developers also owned the property over which the tower would cantilever. Mr. Ertz responded in the affirmative. Mr. Ertz also noted an easement for the cantilevering and the west windows of the tower. The developer's intent is to use the rowhouse at 1708 Rittenhouse as temporary sales offices and then refurbish it.

Using visual aides, Mr. Ertz then described the garden and other revisions to the project. Ms. Voith asked for clarification on the parking. Mr. Ertz then explained the mechanics of the auto storage system. Ms. Voith inquired about the doors on the Manning Street facade of the building, where there is a secondary entrance to the lobby. They are translucent glass and metal doors, replied Mr. Ertz. Mr. Ertz also described carriage lighting along the garden wall. On the Rittenhouse Square side, the lobby entrance is slightly recessed and covered by a glass and metal canopy. Mr. Ertz divided the garage door, which had been a single door, into two doors to reduce its scale. The garage doors are recessed about 24 inches. Mr. Ertz also noted the scale of the surrounding rowhouses. He has attempted to pick up that scale in the divisions of the tower along Rittenhouse. Mr. Ertz commented that he had introduced more openings into the Rittenhouse façade to reduce the mass and scale of the building.

Mr. Ertz then noted the materials. Below the third floor, limestone with horizontal articulations like the Art Alliance and the Barclay will be used. Above that level, the walls will be a panelized material of a similar color and texture to limestone. The windows will have pewter colored mullions and pale green tinted glass. Stainless steel will be used at the ground floor.

Mr. Ertz presented several photos of the work of artisans, one of whom will be chosen to design the garden fencing. Ms. Voith observed these artists' works are very representational. She suggested something more abstract. In response, Mr. Ertz stated that the design would respond to the architecture.

Ms. Voith, noting the time spent discussing the base, asked Mr. Ertz to discuss the top of the building. Mr. Ertz stated that most of the units will be full-floor units. Mr. Zuritsky stated that the units would be about 4,000 square feet. The lower ten floors could be split in half if necessary. The penthouse unit is a two-story unit with a large terrace.

Herbert Levy arrived to join the Committee.

Ms. Voith inquired about the staff recommendation. Mr. Farnham responded that the recommendation was approval pursuant to the Commission's earlier decision. Mr. Farnham noted that the staff was unaware of the series of open issues; he asked the Committee to include the "staff to review details" clause in its recommendation to give the staff the flexibility to approve the minor revisions in the future. Without the "staff to review details" clause, any changes to the design would require the review and approval of the full Commission.

Ms. Voith complimented the applicants on the completeness of the presentation.

Mr. Levy suggested that the Committee recommend approval of the application Mr. Thomas agreed, provided the "staff to review details" clause was included.

Ms. Voith asked for public comment. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance was displeased that the Committee had reached its decision without hearing comments from the public. Mr. Thomas responded that the Committee appreciated all public comments and had simply made an oversight in this instance. Mr. Gallery opined that the design for the north façade of the building had been improved.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Commission's approval of December 2004.

4200-4800 BLOCKS OF CHESTER AVENUE

Applicant: SEPTA

Project: Remove granite-block paving and rails and lay new rails with concrete paving

OVERVIEW: The 4200-4800 blocks of Chester Avenue are designated as historic as part of the Historic Street Paving Thematic District. Currently, the designated cartway consists of two sets of trolley tracks with granite-block paving between the tracks and asphalt outside the tracks. Like the tabled applications for Germantown Avenue, this application proposes the removal of the girder-rail tracks and granite-block paving in the track area and their replacement with T-rail track and concrete. Unlike the Germantown Avenue applications, this application does not propose the paving of the lanes outside the track area in granite block; it proposes no work to the outer lanes. The applicants make several assertions that mirror those made during the Germantown Avenue reviews: 9-inch girder rail is no longer available; the new SEPTA rail system is not compatible with the granite block; granite block paving is very expensive; concrete is safer than granite block; concrete is compatible with SEPTA's maintenance procedures; and concrete would be consistent with other sections of the avenue.

In December 2005, the Commission tabled the application for the 5200-5400 blocks of Germantown Avenue for a period not to exceed six months. In February 2006, the Commission tabled the 7200-7600 block application for a period not to exceed four months. It also created an ad-hoc committee to commission an engineer's report clarifying the competing claims made during the reviews.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Tabling for a period not to exceed six months to allow the Commission to review the findings of its ad hoc committee.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the project to the Architectural Committee. Lydia Grose and Tony Bohare of SEPTA represented the application.

Ms. Grose explained that this stretch of Chester Avenue was last renewed in 1946 and that it is in need of immediate repairs owing to deteriorated conditions of the tracks and the presence of mixed patching materials. She stated that this is the last section of Chester Avenue needing renewal. She elaborated that SEPTA has a five year plan stipulating construction in this section during the summer of 2006. Ms. Grose also noted that SEPTA would like to move forward as soon as possible without delay. Any delay might force SEPTA to take the Route 13 trolley out of service owing to the conditions of the track. Ms. Grose noted that SEPTA is responsible only for the track area, not the shoulder area of the street. She also noted that there are no granite blocks beneath the existing asphalt on this stretch of Chester Avenue.

Mr. Thomas reviewed the findings of the Commission's Germantown Avenue committee, which met in 1999 and 2000 to analyze a similar application. He explained that the committee found that 9" girder rail is no longer available. Also, historically, many streets had block paving in the track areas only and not at the shoulders. He distributed a photograph of light-rail tracks in Portland, Oregon, which showed a stamped concrete

technique that maintained the historic character of downtown Portland. He expressed the importance of maintaining texture, color, size and shapes and, simultaneously, addressing SEPTA's needs. Ms. Grose mentioned that the stamped concrete would be acceptable to SEPTA. However, she noted that it is difficult to patch consistently and would become problem after many plumbers patches. Mr. McCoubrey stated that granite block is a perfect system for plumbers. They simply lift the blocks out, dig their trenches and make their repairs, and then put the block back in the roadway.

Mr. Thomas stated that preservationists should not halt the implementation of this project for many years, as they halted the Germantown Avenue Bridge project. He stated that appearance is very important and asserted that the appearance could be maintained with the stamped concrete. He contended that the Commission should not require SEPTA to return to the track system that is documented in the 1937 drawing. He stated that the Commission should be sensitive to both SEPTA and the historic fabric. Ms. Grose remarked that SEPTA would undertake other maintenance projects instead of the Chester Avenue project if the Commission did not approved.

Ms. Voith asked why repairs to the existing historic pavement are not now done appropriately. Ms. Grose answered that repairs are done by the Streets Department. Mr. Thomas noted that historic streets are, for the most part, paved appropriately.

Ms. Pentz stated that she would like to defer any decision until she has had an opportunity to review the report that will be prepared by an independent engineer; Mr. Levy seconded her comment.

Ms. Voith asked how the rails are held in place. Mr. Bohare explained that the tracks are pinned with anchors set into a concrete bed. He explained that depth is the key issue; if the standard 7.5" rail is used, then the granite blocks will not fit between the concrete bed and the tops of the rails. Ms. Pentz asked if the concrete braces the rails. Ms. Grose stated that it does. Ms. Voith asked if the 9" girder rail could be purchased overseas. Mr. Bohare reported that European rails are not compatible with SEPTA's engineering standards; they are of a lower quality. Ms. Grose seconded Mr. Bohare's comments.

Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Farnham to provide an overview of the Commission's decisions regarding the Germantown Avenue proposals. Mr. Farnham explained that the Commission had tabled the proposals to allow a special committee to commission an engineer's report on the technical questions raised by the applications.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance observed that the chair of the Architectural Committee, who is a member of the Commission and its special paving committee, was not in attendance. He contended that the Commission had been convinced that there were alternatives that would allow the block paving to be reused. He urged the Committee members to be guided by the Commission's decision and wait until the independent report was available. He distributed his diagrams of possible alternative designs for the rail system to the Committee members and offered possible solutions.

Michael Hardy of the University City Historical Society expressed the importance of this application, which, if approved, would establish set an imperfect precedent for the repaving and maintenance of other streets within the West Philadelphia Streetcar National Register District.

Gihon Jordan, a Chester Avenue resident and retired Streets Department engineer, seconded Mr. Gallery's suggestion. He stated that the Streets Department must improve its capacity to repave after plumbing work. He stressed the need for smooth concrete crosswalks that are compatible with strollers and wheelchairs. He also mentioned the need for quality paving and referred to Baltimore Avenue as an example of poor paving. Mr. Thomas thanked Mr. Jordan for his comments and added that Germantown Avenue in Chestnut Hill has smooth crosswalks in the block pavement. He also added that crosswalks were historically paved with large smooth stone slabs.

Ms. Voith requested that Mr. Gallery's sketches for engineering solutions for paving with block around the tracks be sent to the special committee.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend tabling the application for a period not to exceed three months and to recommend that the Commission include a SEPTA representative on its special committee.

2004 DELANCEY STREET

Owner/Applicant: Monica Malpass

History: constructed c.1860, individually designated, contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize work on the highly visible rear ell of this townhouse. A developer was issued a permit for interior work to the house, but sold the property to the current owner without undertaking the work. Without seeking a new permit, the owner undertook interior and exterior work, some of which was not included on the interior permit issued to the previous owner. To accommodate renovations to the kitchen, the owner infilled one window and moved two others. Inappropriate windows were installed in the openings. The altered windows no longer align with the historic windows above. The original windows had plank frames and six-over-six sash; the new windows have thin frames and two-over-two sash. After the owner received a violation, the current owner continued to have the kitchen remodeled and installed a highly visible vent on the exterior. The application includes no elevation drawings showing the exterior work.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the project to the Architectural Committee. Owner Monica Malpass represented the application.

Mr. Baron said that Acorn Development, using a plan drawn by Arlene Matzkin, was issued a permit for interior work before Ms. Malpass purchased the property. Ms. Malpass undertook alterations that exceeded the scope of the permit without seeking a new permit. Mr. Baron showed a Pictometry view of the property from 2004 and a photograph showing the view from the street. He noted that the windows aligned vertically in 2004 and that the windows no longer align. In addition, the middle window has been infilled and a vent has been installed. Mr. Baron noted that the new plans submitted with the current application by Ms. Malpass call for interior work only. The building permit submitted with the current application notes the installation of new windows due to deterioration, but makes no mention of altering masonry openings. Mr.

Baron stated that the unpermitted work continued even after the violation was issued.

Ms. Malpass stated that the old windows were in very poor condition and one had fallen out. She said that she bought the rights to the permit from the previous contractor, who told her she could go to the Department of Licenses & Inspections and pay for the permit. She conceded that her work did not comply with the permit issued to the former owner. She claimed that her new windows matched the historical windows. She asserted that while installing windows, her contractors discovered bricks that were disintegrating, which were replaced. Ms. Malpass said she purchased the salvaged bricks that matched those at her house. She gave instructions to her contractor to use a "grout" that would match the existing mortar as closely as possible. Ms. Malpass asserted that she had spared no expense to maintain the integrity of the building.

Ms. Voith asked the applicant why, after receiving the violation notice, she continued the work. Ms. Malpass claimed she never knew she was not allowed to complete the interior work, but acknowledged that she was informed that the project required the Historical Commission's review.

Ms. Voith stated that she was confused about the timing of the work. Mr. Baron responded that he inspected the property about four or five months ago and then requested that the Department issue a violation. Mr. Baron later met with Ms. Malpass and expressed concern over the continued interior work. He had noted that the interior work had exterior consequences that could exceed the scope of the permit and might be expensive to correct.

Mr. Baron noted the lack of exterior elevation drawings and observed that the interior drawings did not mention the moving or infilling of windows or the addition of the vent. Mr. Baron asserted that the illegal work exceeded the installation of incorrect windows; it also included the moving of window openings and associated masonry work. Ms. Malpass observed that her side windows face a parking area and a dilapidated structure next door. Ms. Voith explained that the Committee seeks to preserve the historical character of rear ell; the misalignment of the windows is of great concern, owing to their high degree of visibility. Mr. Baron noted that staff regularly approves window replacement and that the need for venting might have been addressed by retaining the middle window and removing a pane to install a flush vent. He said that the Commission has routinely required restaurants to install flush vents rather than projecting fan units. He said several alternatives could have achieved the applicant's design goals while preserving the historic window locations.

Ms. Milhollen of the Preservation Alliance reported her concerns about the visibility from 20th Street. She also recalled that this property was restored and modernized with new rear windows in the 1980s.

Mr. Baron said that violations were issued for the adjacent property at the same time. He is working with the owner to correct the non-compliant alterations.

Ms. Pentz asked if the original windows were six-over-six windows. Mr. Baron responded that historically builders used less expensive windows with the small panes of glass and wide structural frames at the backs of these types of houses; the historic windows were six-over-six windows. Mr. Baron stated that the movement of the windows is more significant than the inappropriate frames and sash. Mr. Thomas regretted the

relocation of these highly visible windows.

Mr. Thomas explained to the applicant that the Committee must recommend denial of the legalization. He suggested to Ms. Malpass that she appear before the Commission to present her case. Ms. Malpass stated that she would incur great expense to undo the illegal work. She claimed that removing the cabinetry would cause the walls of the rear ell to collapse. Ms. Voith explained that the Committee is an advisory body. She elaborated that the Commission has the authority to consider issues that are outside the Committee's purview. Owing to a previously scheduled appointment, Ms. Malpass said she would not be able to attend the next Commission meeting. Mr. Baron suggested that she request in writing that the Commission continue her application to its following meeting.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the legalization proposal, pursuant to Standard 2 [*The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*]; Standard 6 [*Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.*]; and Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.*].

2100 DELANCEY STREET AKA 328-30 S. 21ST STREET

Owner: Lily Properties, Robert Volpe, principle

Applicant: Edward Bell, architect

History: built 1905, architects, Okie, Duhring & Ziegler

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a rooftop addition and roof decks on this apartment building, which is being converted to condominiums. The building currently has an elevator penthouse and a very small apartment unit on the roof. The developer wishes to expand the rooftop space. The new penthouse would feature a metal roof and cream-colored stucco and tile walls. The applicant contends that the addition would be minimally visible from directly across the street. However, the staff contends that it would be highly visible along the south and other facades and when viewed diagonally from the streets.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Edward Bell and developer Robert Volpe represented the application.

Mr. Bell presented photographs of existing roof conditions. Mr. Baron presented photographs of the building in its context and opined that some expansion of the roof penthouse would meet the preservation standards. He objected to the proposed addition owing to its potential visibility; it would be a large addition with a very small setback. He

recommended that the applicant and the staff meet in the field to develop a scheme with less public visibility.

Mr. Bell distributed a sight-line study to the Committee members. Mr. Baron noted that the sight-line study was inaccurate because it depicted a line from the sidewalk, not from five feet above the sidewalk, the viewpoint of an adult. Mr. Bell stated that he had developed a computer model. He claimed that at a distance 80' from the building, an observer would only see the edge of the roof of the addition. Even at 130', one would not be able to see the side of the addition. The side of the addition would only be visible at 230'.

Mr. Thomas asked about proposed materials. Mr. Bell answered that they proposed a masonry construction with stone, tile, or stucco cladding in an earth tone to match the existing building; the addition would be roofed with a dark grey or charcoal metal.

Ms. Voith contended that the addition was stylistically at odds with the historic building. She asked if a flat roof would be possible. Mr. Bell answered that it would be possible, but that such a roof would make the addition more visible. He had selected a pitched roof to reduce visibility. Mr. Thomas agreed with Mr. Bell and added that as long as the addition was not visible it did not necessarily need to match or respond to the historic building. Mr. Levy mentioned that he believed the addition was too close to the edge and would be visible from Delancey. He also mentioned that the fenestration at the addition did not relate to the fenestration of the historic building. Mr. Thomas noted that the relationship of the fenestration to the historic building was not significant if the addition was not visible. Ms. Voith asked how much setback the addition would have from the balustrade. Mr. Bell answered that the addition would be set back 3.5' from the balustrade.

Mr. Baron stated that the Commission typically asked for setbacks of approximately fifteen feet for roof decks in Old City. He contended that 3.5' was an extremely small setback for an addition that would be larger and more visible than a deck. He also said that this application proposes decks with no setbacks. Mr. Levy reminded everyone that the Committee has consistently recommended denial of similar designs with visibility problems. Mr. Thomas seconded Mr. Levy's comments.

Mr. Baron mentioned that the connected three-story building next door might be a better place for an addition. Mr. Bell replied that the roof of the building housed HVAC equipment. Mr. Baron suggested working with the applicant to diminish the visibility of the addition. He suggested a site visit with sightline poles and flags. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. Barons' suggestion.

Mr. Volpe asked the Committee members why the Commission had approved other rooftop additions. He referred to the Lippincott Building on S. 6th Street and the Saunders Building at Locust and Washington Square. Mr. Baron explained that the Lippincott addition was only approved after a finding of financial hardship based on the significant cost of chemical abatement in the former printing plant allowed the Commission to relax its standards. Committee members explained that the building at Locust and Washington Square is much larger than the building in question and that the addition was set back a very significant distance from the facades. Mr. Thomas seconded that comment and also mentioned that the subject building is of a much smaller scale than the two on Washington Square.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.*].

103-107 CHURCH STREET

Owner: Zagara Management, John Zagara

Applicant: Hugh Zimmers, Zimmers Associates, architects

History: built c. 1830 for Girard Estate

OVERVIEW: This proposal seeks to legalize work that does not comply with the plans approved by the Historical Commission. The approved plans included recessed balconies at the west. The balconies were replaced with windows in the plane of the party wall. Also, a greenhouse stair enclosure was added above the approved open stairs to the roof. The roof top addition already is visible from the waterfront, the stair enclosure adds to the height of the approved rooftop additions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the windows, denial of the stair enclosure, pursuant to Standard 9

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Hugh Zimmers, the architect, represented the application.

Mr. Zimmers explained that he had been the architect for the rehabilitation, but was not the architect for this particular unit. The developer had asked him to remedy the permitting problems with this unit. Mr. Zimmers stated that the stair enclosure would be deleted from the application because it violated the zoning-prescribed height limit.

Mr. Zimmers explained that he had informed the owner of the unit that any deviations from the approved plans would require the review of the Historical Commission. He also mentioned to the owner that the windows on the party wall would require a variance from the Board of Building Standards. Mr. Zimmers acknowledged that the owner of the unit pressed ahead with the revised design without the requisite municipal reviews. Mr. Zimmers added that he felt compelled to disclose another revision to the design. He explained that the owner of the penthouse had contacted the window manufacturer and requested that the windows for his unit be fabricated without mullions, thereby deviating from the approved plan. The Commission had approved true-divided-light windows for the entire complex in both historic and new window openings. Mr. Zimmers added that the penthouse windows are visible from Church Street and from the rear along Cuthbert Street. He concluded that he neither approved the change to the window design, nor does he condone it.

Mr. Thomas thought that the windows should be retrofitted with an applied muntin. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. Thomas and added that a pane size mirroring the historic pane size below would be appropriate. Ms. Pentz and Ms. Voith both agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to

recommend legalization of the construction of windows instead of balconies and the inclusion of additional window openings in west elevation, denial of stair enclosure, and denial of the non-compliant undivided, single-pane windows in the penthouse, pursuant to Standard 9 [*New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize a property. The new work 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.*]; and the Roofs Guideline [*Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.*].

2513 LAMBERT STREET

Owner/applicants: Bruno & Maria Leuzzi

History: built 1912

OVERVIEW: The applicants propose the demolition of the non-historic enclosed rear porch and the construction of a larger enclosed porch in its place. The porch is minimally visible from the rear down a neighboring driveway on 20th Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: approval, pursuant to Standard 9

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Ms. Leuzzi, the owner, explained that the roof is leaking and that they need to rebuild the porch. The Committee members agreed that the alteration would be minimally visible and would not require the demolition of significant historic fabric.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to 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.*].

506 DELANCEY STREET

Owner: Sarah Williams

Applicant: Jesse Burns

History: Built c. 1810. Individually designated in 04/30/1957, a contributing resource within the Society Hill Historic District in 1999.

Project: Rear demolition and addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish the original c. 1810 rear façade of a Federal style townhouse in Society Hill. The demolition would include the entire rear wall, back slope of the gable roof, and rear dormer. The new addition would be four floors tall and would extend to the outer wall of the existing one-story kitchen wing. The rear of this property is visible from S. 5th Street at an oblique angle. The applicant proposes a contemporary design for the new rear wall and non-historical window arrangements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, owing to the significant loss of historic fabric, and pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Jesse Burns, the daughter of the owner and the future resident, and architect Alex Terzich represented the proposal.

The architect explained that his proposal was contemporary, not contextual, in style. He asserted that the rear was only minimally visible from 5th Street. The alteration would have a minimal impact on the historic district. Ms. Pentz noted that this building was individually designated. She asserted that the question before the Committee was not merely a question of the impact of the alterations on the district. She stated that this was an historic building; the project would require the demolition of a large amount of historic fabric. Ms Burns noted that other buildings in the area had modern rear additions. Ms. Pentz stated that she did not know the individual circumstances of the alterations, but that it was the charge of this Committee to protect historic fabric. Ms. Voith, and Messrs. Thomas and McCoubrey agreed, stating that they had significant concerns about the proposed demolition of early nineteenth-century fabric. Rebecca Stoloff of the Society Hill Civic Association stated that her organization has concerns about the proposal as well from both preservation and zoning perspectives. She suggested a more compatible addition. Bernice Hammell, also of the Society Hill Civic Association, opposed the design and suggested that the applicant find ways to preserve more historic fabric. She asserted that the project should be redesigned.

Ms. Burns noted the modern buildings to the east on Delancey Street. Ms. Voith countered that those buildings do not justify this proposal. She noted that this is an important, early building and warranted preservation. Mr. Thomas echoed Ms. Voith's statements, saying that the Committee could not recommend the demolition because modern buildings stand a few doors to the east. Ms. Burns reported that other buildings in the area had a variety of additions including the synagogue behind them. Committee members remarked that those additions might have taken place prior to designation and stressed that this was an intact Federal rowhouse that should be preserved.

The Committee members suggested that they may support a revised proposal for a rear addition that connected to the historic building below the cornice line. A revised proposal should preserve the historic roof, dormer, and rear wall. They suggested a traditional rear ell. They said that windows in the historic rear wall could be cut down to make doors into the addition, but that the rear wall should be preserved.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 2 [*The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.*]; Standard 5 [*Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.*]; Standard 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.*]; and 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.].

FAIRMOUNT WATERWORKS

Time: 11:30 p.m., 10 March 2006

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Brett Webber

History: 1810 to 1830

Project: Add canopies to front door and across terrace; replace entrance door; add planters and green screen; install lighting fixtures; remove portion of balustrade; and install outside bar.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to make several alterations to two buildings at the Fairmount Waterworks, the engine house and eastern mill house. The rehabilitated buildings will house a restaurant.

At the engine house, the applicant proposes to install a new steel-framed entry canopy at the eastern entrance. It would have removable side fabric for winter use. This entrance would be used as the main entrance to the establishment. On the south façade, a cold storage unit is proposed; it would be enclosed by a “greenscreen” fence. A sunshade canopy supported by a steel frame would be installed at the west (Schuylkill) façade. The canopy would not extend the entire width of the building, but would cover the middle section of the building. A wood door on this façade would be removed and replaced with a frameless glass door.

At the mill house, the application proposes to remove a section of cast-iron balustrades adjacent to the engine house terrace. A wet bar is proposed for the south façade. This bar would be a U-shaped piece of outdoor furniture, but would incorporate a concealed plumbing line that would penetrate the wall.

Hanging lights are proposed for the terraces of both buildings. In addition, wall mounted lights and up-lights are proposed to illuminate the west facades and terrace columns. The upper floors of the building would be internally illuminated with a glow diffuser screen.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the east-facing entrance canopy; interior window lighting at the upper floors of Engine House; wet bar provided no utility lines penetrate the Mill House wall above grade; “greenscreen” and cold storage unit; removal of balustrade provided all removed pieces are stored on site (It is preferred that the entire section be removed rather than cut); and the column and façade lighting; with staff to review details; pursuant to Standards 2, 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. The meeting was attended by Brett Webber, the architect, and Mark Focht, Stephanie Craighead, and Theresa Stuhlman of the Fairmount Park Commission.

Mr. Webber thoroughly presented the project, focusing on each item of the proposal. He described work to the engine house, connecting breezeway, and “caretaker’s house.”

Mr. Webber explained that he would prefer to attach the northeast entry canopy to the building to eliminate two vertical support members. The Committee members unanimously noted that they preferred the freestanding canopy shown in the application drawings.

The Committee members supported the proposal for lighting the upper-floor windows. However, they disapproved of the idea of the outdoor wet-bar as a fixed element with utility attachments that cut through the wall of the mill house (caretaker's house). However, they supported the idea of a mobile bar with a utility connection through the floor, away from any exterior walls of the mill house.

The Committee accepted the need for the cold storage room and the greenscreen, but requested that the cold storage unit be clearly separated from the engine house.

The Committee requested that, if possible, the balustrade be removed as a single piece, rather than cut. The removed pieces should be stored on site.

The Committee questioned the column lighting, in particular the decision to light the side of the columns and not the front. They asked about the electrical connections and the issue of illuminating the porch glazing. They thought that this would require a mock up to determine an appropriate configuration. They disapproved of the hanging lights within the porticos.

Mr. Webber described the five canvas sun awnings proposed for the porch. He said they would be supported by a twelve-inch roll-up housing attached to the entablature of the portico and metal supports at the balustrade along the river. He explained that they would be motorized. The Committee members deemed the sun shades on the west porch inappropriate. Ms. Pentz said that the Committee had been very generous when it recommended approval of the glazing of the porch several years ago. The sunscreens would additionally compromise the porch area. She stated that the fixed sunscreen system would hide the essential element on the signature façade of the building, the colonnade. Ms. Voith suggested umbrellas instead.

Mr. Webber described the proposal for a frameless glass door. He said that code would require the door to swing in both directions to provide egress from the porch. He said that this would require the modification of the opening. The glass was needed for visibility. Herb Levy suggested that the wood doors be left in place and a second set of glass doors be placed in the interior; this would allow the users to close the wood door when the restaurant was not in use. Other Committee members suggested that the glazed egress door should be located in the new glass wall of the adjacent breezeway because it is not historic fabric.

The Committee opened the floor for public comments. John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance commended the Committee for its careful review and the architect and applicant for trying to minimize the impact on the exterior. He preferred this application to a prior one that proposed a large addition. He agreed with the Committee that the sunscreen would hide an essential element of the engine house. He expressed a concern that the front seating area demarcated with table-height planters and bushes would make this public building seem private and unapproachable. Ms. Voith concurred that the planters were inappropriate and visually truncated the building from its base. Committee members thought that the tables alone would sufficiently demarcate the eating area.

The Committee members stressed that several aspects of the proposal such as the lighting and egress door should be revised and resubmitted for review.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommended approval of the following:

1. the canvas entry awning as a freestanding element,
2. lighting of the upper floor windows,
3. a mobile wet-bar with utilities accessed through the floor,
4. a refrigerator room and HVAC hidden by a “green screen” set away from the engine house,
5. and the removal of the balustrade in a single piece, to be stored on site.

The Committee recommended denial of the following:

6. the fixed wet bar and through-wall utilities,
7. lighting the portico columns,
8. hanging lights in the portico,
9. sunshades over the west porch,
10. removal of the wood door and replacement with frameless glass doors,
11. and the planters outlining the front dining area.

The Committee made these recommendations with the staff to review details, pursuant to 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 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.*]; and 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.*].

2028-2030 FAIRMOUNT AVENUE

Time: 11:45 p.m., 10 March 2006

Owner: Savvas Navrosidis

Applicant: Aaron Childs

History: Built c. 1859, combined with 2030 Fairmount. Designated contributing within the Spring Garden Historic District on 10/11/2000

Project: Construct two-story rear addition with deck and stairhouse

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story rear addition on an existing one-story rear addition. The rear masonry wall would remain within the new addition. The addition would be faced with stucco and would have a bay window on the rear facade. In addition the applicant proposes a roof deck, which would sit on the new addition. This deck would be accessed through a penthouse that would also sit on the new addition.

This application also proposes to alter the non-historic storefronts facing Fairmount Avenue. In April 2003, the Historical Commission reviewed and approved the reconstruction of the historic storefronts based on the surviving historic storefront at 2026 Fairmount. The applicant never acted on that approval. In October 2004, the

Historical Commission reviewed and approved a new storefront design. The currently proposed storefront design possesses similarities to the design approved on October 2004, but is not a restoration. The new design maintains the ADA ramp facing Fairmount Avenue and creates one single entrance at the top of the ramp; the 2004 design proposed two separate doors. The new design also eliminates any other entrances to the upper floors on 2030 and combines all ingress to both buildings at the east side of 2028. The storefront design is articulated in the same manner as previously approved with wood panels below and storefront windows with transoms above. The storefront is terminated by a simple wood cornice with decorative wood medallions.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of rear addition, roof deck and stair enclosure, pursuant Standard 9

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee and explained that the applicant had withdrawn the previous application owing to surveying and drafting errors on the drawings. The applicant has corrected these errors in the new application.

Mr. Danta explained the staff's recommendation for denial of the proposed storefront alterations and compared the proposed storefront to the 2004 approved storefront. He mentioned that the new storefront alterations did not respond to the upper floors and presented an awkward articulation. Mr. Danta noted that the approved storefront of 2004 would be more sympathetic to the historic building.

The applicant offered to the Committee that he was willing to make any revisions it mandated. Mr. Danta explained that the Committee's duty was to review and advise the Commission on applications. He further noted that the applicant already had received approval for a new storefront and that he could proceed with that design.

Mr. Rivera asked if the subject properties had been combined into one property. Mr. Childs responded they were now one property.

Mr. Childs explained that the applicant wished to alter the storefront, but maintain some of its existing features such as the ADA ramp. Mr. Danta clarified that the application presented and then withdrawn last month did not propose any changes to the storefront and that the Committee's recommendation of denial was based on drafting errors and the location of the deck and stairhouse. Ms. Voith expressed concern over the finials that articulate the entablature of the storefront. She suggested redesigning the fenestration to more harmoniously respond to the upper floors. She also suggested including a blind door on 2030 to create symmetry and to indicate that it was a separate building historically. Mr. Navrosidas, the owner of the property, stated that they would then revert to the previously approved design for the storefront. He asked the Committee members if they wanted the ADA ramp removed or left in place; it was not shown on the plans for the storefront that was previously approved. Mr. Danta advised Mr. Navrosidis that the 2004 storefront approval did not include an ADA ramp and that, if he would like to maintain the ADA ramp, the elevation drawing of the storefront should be updated to reflect its inclusion.

Mr. Navrosidas remarked that at the previous hearing he was told that his design was deficient because it provided no clear distinction between the historic building and the addition on the party wall, delineating the old from the new. Mr. Danta responded that

that comment was based on a faulty architectural drawing. With the newly corrected drawing, it was no longer relevant. Mr. Danta then noted that the addition would only be visible through an empty lot at 2032 Fairmount.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the second and third-floor rear addition, stairhouse, and deck, pursuant to 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 work shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale, and proportions, and massing, to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.*]; and 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.*].

The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the storefront alterations as submitted, pursuant to 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.*]; and the Storefronts Guideline [*Recommended, Re-creating a missing storefront or storefront features that existed during the restoration period based on physical or documentary evidence; for example, duplicating a display window or transom.*].

223-225 S. 6TH STREET, DILWORTH HOUSE

Owner: John and Mary Turchi

Applicant: Neil Sklaroff, Esq.

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

Project: In concept, demolish significant building, construct 15-story residential building

OVERVIEW: This in-concept application proposes to completely demolish the former home of Mayor Richardson Dilworth, which is listed as significant in the Society Hill Historic District, and construct a 15-story residential building in its place. A portion of the front façade of the historic building would be reconstructed in a new location, at the back of the ground-level arcade of the new building.

On February 27, one day prior to the Architectural Committee meeting, the applicants submitted an alternate proposal. For the record, the staff considers the direct distribution of application materials to members of the Architectural Committee to be incompatible with the Commission's standard submission procedures. Although the staff did not have an opportunity to thoroughly analyze the alternate design before the Committee meeting, it appears to propose the retention of most but not all of the historic building and the construction of a tower at the rear of the site.

The current in-concept application is the second submitted for this project. The first proposed to completely demolish the house and construct a 15-story residential building in its place. The Architectural Committee reviewed the application in July 2005 and recommended denial. In August 2005, the Commission tabled the application for a period not to exceed six months. The application was placed on the Commission's

agenda for February 2006 because the six-month tabling period was expiring. The applicant withdrew the proposal prior to its review.

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

Section 14-2007(7)(j) of the Philadelphia Code defines the conditions under which the Commission may approve the demolition of an historic building. "No permit shall be issued for the demolition 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." Section 14-2007(2)(f) defines demolition as the "razing or destruction, whether entirely or in significant part, of a building." The current proposal must be considered a demolition as it is defined in the ordinance. The applicant has proffered no claim of hardship or public interest to justify the demolition. The applicant has contended that this building does not contribute to the historic district, but the Architectural Committee is not qualified to address the merits of this claim. Until the Commission has determined that this building does not contribute to the historic district, this Committee must view the Dilworth House as a significant resource in the district and must recommend denial of the demolition.

Putting aside the question of demolition momentarily, the architectural and preservation merits of the proposal can be addressed. The Dilworth House stands away from its taller neighbors to the north and south, revealing its side walls and rear ell. It includes a steeply-pitched slate roof with brick chimney and a broad cornice and pent eave that wrap around the building. It is an assertively three-dimensional object in an historic city center largely populated by two-dimensional facades. If the proposal submitted on February 6 is accepted, the entirety of the historic building would be demolished. A portion of the front façade would be salvaged and reconstructed within the entry arcade of the new building. The reconstructed portion of the façade would stand several feet to the northeast of its historic position. Shorn of its side walls, roof, cornice, and pent eave, the historic three-dimensional building would be rendered planar, losing its essential character. The remaining fragment would speak not of the former building's significance, but only of its demolition. The architectural and preservation communities have unconditionally rejected this brand of development, which is known as facadism, facadomy, or, illogically, facadectomy, because it fails to satisfy the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties*.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: denial of the demolition of the significant resource, pursuant to §14-2007(7)(j) of the Philadelphia Code; and the denial of the reconstruction and new construction delineated in the February 6 proposal, pursuant to 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 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.]; and 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.]. The staff offers no recommendation on the alternate proposal of February 27, which it did not have an adequate opportunity to review.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner John Turchi, attorneys Neil Sklaroff and Matt McClure, consultant Craig Schelter, and architects Robert Venturi, Carey Yonce, and Matt Conti represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff introduced Mr. Venturi, who presented the architectural renderings. He explained that his approach to this design was based on the great variety of architecture found around the Square. He stated that every building on the square except Hopkinson House and the Dilworth House, which are set back, stand at the sidewalk line. He stated that he had wanted to erect the new building replacing the Dilworth House at the sidewalk line, providing more uniformity to the Square, which now has great variety. He stated that the "Dilworth House is not that distinguished as a piece of architecture." He added that, in the original proposal, he attempted to celebrate the importance of the site without retaining the physical building. With the first scheme, he sought to take advantage of the opportunity for "iconography" in the arcade of the new building; the Dilworth House would be demolished, but an iconographic display would provide an explanation of Mayor Dilworth where the house once stood. Mr. Venturi stated that his new construction would support the south wall of the Athenaeum. In the scheme proposed in the current application, Mr. Venturi would retain a portion of the façade of the historic building and place it against the façade of the new building within an arcade. He noted that he would not retain any of the roof of the historic building with the current or second scheme. He then explained that he has developed a new scheme; in the latest or third scheme, which was distributed directly to the Committee members yesterday, Mr. Venturi proposes retaining most of the Dilworth House and erecting an apartment building at the rear of the lot with all pedestrian and parking ingress and egress at Randolph Street. The new building would not connect to the remaining section of the Dilworth House. He explained that the newly proposed apartment tower, which is set at the rear of the lot, is very different than the building proposed in the original and current applications; it is set far back from its neighbors along the square and can therefore be very different. He also added that the revised design will not support the Athenaeum's south party wall. Mr. Venturi concluded by introducing his colleagues, Carey Yonce and another architect.

Mr. Schelter contended that Mayor Dilworth could be memorialized in many places, not only at the Dilworth House. He claimed that the Mayor's career is better embodied in his residence on St. James Street than it is at the Dilworth House. He asserted that the Dilworth House did not need to be the "total symbol" for Mayor Dilworth. He then presented photographs of the townhouses that had occupied the Dilworth House site until 1956. He stated that the earlier townhouses "preserved the predominant character of the street wall around Washington Square." He asserted that the Dilworth House is only one of the many layers of history and that historic districts should not be static or frozen, but should allow for new history. He added that he believed the first two schemes

related to the context of the square in ways that could not be achieved with the retention of the Dilworth house in the third scheme. He claimed that the luxury condominium building proposed in the first two schemes would have a “long-term importance.” He noted that it would comply with the current C4 zoning and would not require variances. Mr. Schelter also stated that the first two schemes are within allowed height limitations and would not need a variance. He concluded that the preservation of the historic building, as shown in the third scheme, would negatively impact the neighbors. For example, it would require the blocking of windows on the north party wall of the Lippincott Building; it would impact the adjacent owners on Randolph Street; and it would not provide support for the south party wall for the Athenaeum, nor would it provide the collections storage space for it. He noted that the third scheme, the apartment building proposal, brings the preservation of the Dilworth House and the preservation of the neighborhood into opposition. Preserving history will have a negative or “less good” impact on the surroundings.

Mr. Sklaroff asked Mr. Venturi to discuss the arcade and windows. Mr. Venturi stated that the use of a colonnade at the base in the first two schemes allows the design to connect to the square and its neighbors; the connection would not occur with the latest revision. Mr. Yonce added that the windows in the reconstructed façade would be used as real windows; they would open into occupied spaces behind them. Ms. Voith and Mr. Thomas asked the architects to display their plans for the three schemes.

Mr. Thomas requested the guidance of the staff regarding the issue of demolition. Mr. Farnham stated that the latest scheme does not appear to require significant demolition. Mr. Farnham explained that the Committee should not recommend approval of any scheme proposing whole or significant demolition without the Commission first reclassifying the building to non-contributing or finding that the demolition would alleviate a financial hardship or be in the public interest. He added that the first and third schemes were not part of this application; the first had been withdrawn and third had not been officially submitted. Mr. Thomas explained that he was reluctant to start a discussion of the second scheme, the facadomy, because it was not significantly different from the original, withdrawn proposal. Mr. Farnham stated that the third scheme was submitted one day prior to the Committee meeting; the staff and the public had not had an adequate opportunity to review it. Ms. Voith asked rhetorically why the application was before the Committee if it could not recommend approval of it. Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee’s position on the second scheme should be no different than its position on the first scheme, denial owing to the demolition pursuant to the *Rules & Regulations* and the *Standards*. Mr. Thomas then asked if the Committee should comment on the third scheme in light of the fact that it was submitted only one day in advance of the review with no time for a staff review. Mr. Farnham added that the public had likewise not had an opportunity to review the third scheme.

Mr. Levy stated that the Dilworth House should be on the National Register; it meets the criteria. He noted that the National Register’s 50-year rule is only a guideline and should not disqualify it from the Register. He also noted that Philadelphia already has an example of facadomy, the Egyptian Revival façade of the Pennsylvania Fire Insurance building around the corner from the Dilworth House. He stated that, despite the significance of Mitchell-Giurgola Penn Mutual building, he did not want to see it repeated.

Mr. Sklaroff explained that it has been his experience before the Committee that

revisions to applications have been accepted during the review process. He stated that, as a courtesy, he had the revised design hand delivered to the Committee members, Commission staff, and opposition. Mr. Sklaroff added that they were requesting comments on the architecture, not on the designation matter. He remarked that he is requesting that the Committee recommend approval of the demolition. He is requesting that the Committee provide feedback on the architectural merits on the proposed construction. He explained that the third proposal was developed because some stakeholders would like to see the building retained. He noted that the apartment building would have a different impact on the neighborhood than would the condominium building. He suggested that the Commission's jurisdiction over the third proposal would be review-and-comment jurisdiction only.

Mr. Turchi explained that he has found a contractor to photograph, dismantle, and reconstruct the façade as proposed in the second scheme. He also explained that the reconstructed façade would be integrated into the new tower in the second scheme. He mentioned that the mezzanine level of the new building would be offered to the Athenaeum for storage. The building proposed in the second scheme would be "an attractive product." Mr. Schelter added that the reconstructed façade would preserve the historic scale of the Dilworth House.

Mr. Rivera asked for clarification on the Committee's review procedures. Mr. Farnham stated that, despite Mr. Sklaroff's characterization of his position, he advised the Committee to provide as much feedback to the applicant as possible. He noted that the application was an in-concept application and that no building permit could ever issue from an in-concept review. He also noted that the Committee should not recommend approval with the classification and hardship or public interest issues outstanding, but that it could provide comments on the architectural aspects of the proposal to guide the applicants as they develop their design.

Ms. Voith asked the applicants to explain the differences between the second and third schemes. Mr. Turchi explained that the second scheme, which he favored, would best serve the neighboring buildings; it would preserve the north-facing windows of the Lippincott Building and would buttress the south party wall of the Athenaeum. He said that the second scheme, the 12-unit condominium scheme, would preserve the light and air of the neighboring buildings. He explained that the third scheme, which was distributed yesterday, would be an apartment building. It would have a negative impact on its neighbors; for example, it would block windows and not stabilize the Athenaeum. He asserted that the wall along the south is a party wall and that he may decide to block the windows in it. He reported that the south wall of the Athenaeum, along the northern edge of his property, has been moving since the Dilworths demolished the former buildings on the site 50 years ago. He stated that the building proposed in the third scheme would not be a luxury condominium tower, but a rental building with 50 one-bedroom apartments. The apartments would be 880 square feet each, "the most salable product."

Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee could not recommend approval of the facadomy, the second scheme, because it did not comply with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*. Also, the applicant did not submit the third scheme with the application and had not allowed sufficient time for its review. Mr. Thomas recommended further study and review of the third scheme because it is "a compromise that can work." He stated that the third scheme would be "worth pursuing." He remarked that having the entrance

on Randolph Street, off St. James, might, in fact, be a benefit for the apartment building.

Ms. Voith stated that, in her opinion, the third scheme was a threat. She contended that the developer was essentially saying: "If you do not like my first building, then take this building, which is worse." Mr. Turchi responded that it was not a threat. He stated that the first two schemes, which would require demolition, would produce elegant buildings that complied with the site's zoning. He asserted that the third scheme would address preservation concerns and business issues relating to the changing market, but would not be as much of a benefit for the neighborhood. Mr. Schelter seconded his statement, asserting that it is not possible to save the historic building and build a luxury, high-end condominium building on the site. Ms. Voith asked if the Dilworth House could be used as an entrance to a new building. Mr. Turchi replied in the negative, stating that he could put two residential units or a commercial unit in the Dilworth House and erect the apartment building behind it. Mr. Schelter also answered that they could not install the entrance in the historic house; it would not satisfy the building code requirements. Mr. Turchi commented that he was simply responding to changing market conditions with the third scheme. He noted that the men on the Committee, as architects, are aware of the need to respond to housing market when designing. Ms. Voith reminded Mr. Turchi that she is also an architect. Mr. Turchi stated that he is convinced that he can sell condominiums in the building proposed in the first two schemes, but cannot sell condominiums in the third building. He concluded, explaining that he can demolish the historic building, build a high-end building, and make a profit; he can save the historic building, build an apartment building, and make a profit; but he cannot save the historic building, build a high-end building, and make a profit.

The Committee noted that the plans for the third scheme that were hand delivered yesterday differ significantly from the third-scheme plans on display today for the Committee. Mr. Turchi explained that Mr. Younce had made a mistake when calculating the FAR. To correct the mistake, they had reduced the height of the third-scheme building from 15 floors to 11 floors.

Mr. Levy suggested "with no thought at all" that the applicant move the entire building and incorporate it into the new tower. Mr. Schelter responded that it would not be practically or economically feasible. Ms. Voith and Messrs. Thomas and Rivera stated emphatically that they would not support moving the building. The applicants likewise dismissed the suggestion that it be moved. Mr. Levy responded that he was merely thinking out loud. Mr. Schelter stated that the Dilworth House was "wrong from Day One" because it is set back from the street. He reiterated that the Venturi-designed building would be "new history for the square." He added that the Society Hill redevelopment guidelines had mandated that all new construction in Society Hill respect the street façade and be of a contemporary design, yet the Dilworth's house did not. Mr. Schelter commented that he believes in "both-and," not "either-or." With the scheme two, the facadomy, one could have "both-and," both the historic building and the new building, which would, itself, become historic. He stated that he has a great deal of experience with preservation and is a preservationist at heart. Ms. Voith stated that the second or current scheme, which proposes rebuilding the façade in the arcade, was not viable. She added that she did not want to comment on the third scheme, which is not kind to the urban context. Mr. Schelter replied that that was the point of the third design. When Ms. Voith remarked that she liked the first scheme more than the second, Mr. Thomas stated that the Committee is not charged with determining what it does and does not like, but what does and does not meet the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards*.

Mr. Gallery of the Preservation Alliance distributed a written statement to the Committee and urged it not to comment on the new designs until the designation review was complete. He reminded the Committee that it must recommend denial of any proposal that includes the demolition of the historic building. Mr. Galley applauded Mr. Turchi for recognizing the importance of Dilworth House with the third scheme. However, he stated that scant plans were provided, making it impossible for the public to comment on the revised design. He added that, in his view, the latest revision was a serious proposal, but that it needed work. He suggested that Mr. Turchi submit an application for the third scheme so that the Committee could review it. Mr. Rivera agreed with Mr. Sklaroff that the Committee should provide guidance to the applicants. However, he agreed with Mr. Gallery that the applicants had not provided sufficient information on the third scheme for a complete review.

Paul Boni of the Society Hill Civic Association summarized his views on the appropriate processing of the three schemes. He noted that the first scheme had been withdrawn in writing and therefore was not before the Committee today. He stated that the second scheme was the only matter before the Committee today. The Committee must recommend denial of the second scheme because it presupposes the demolition of a historic building classified as significant. He asserted that the submission of the third scheme did not comply with the Commission's requirements. It was submitted one day in advance of the meeting; the public did not have an opportunity to review it. Also, the third scheme had changed significantly since it was distributed one day ago. The Committee should not make a recommendation on the third scheme. Mr. Boni then reported that the City Council had recently passed a resolution supporting the preservation of the Dilworth House. He also referred to a letter from State Senator Vincent Fumo supporting the preservation of the house. He agreed with Mr. Gallery's comments and requested that Mr. Turchi present this latest proposal to the Civic Association at its next meeting on 13 March 2006.

Dan Haviland, a resident of the Lippincott Building, expressed his opposition to the third scheme. He explained that he had recently purchased a unit in the Lippincott Building. He claimed that the court had upheld the legality of the windows along the north party wall. Regarding the third scheme, he asserted that adequate notice is needed for due process. He also asserted that the third scheme is a threat as Ms. Voith had alleged. He contended that a large garage on Randolph Street would significantly add to what is already "a traffic nightmare." He also noted that, in his opinion, the neighbors would be greatly opposed to this plan. He urged the applicants to maintain better communications with his neighbors and cautioned the Committee not to accept a commitment from Mr. Turchi.

Mr. Thomas excused himself from the meeting.

Mr. Sklaroff once again reiterated the purpose of their application and requested guidance from the Committee. He stated that his team is willing to explore all three options in good faith. He noted that the Committee has accepted revisions to proposals after its submission deadline. He advised the Committee that it could make a recommendation on the third scheme. He added that he would provide as much notice to the neighbors as possible.

Mr. Rivera instructed the Committee that it must officially comment on the second

scheme only. The other two are not before the Committee officially. He stated that he would vote to recommend denial of the second scheme. Mr. Levy concurred and stated that he would vote to recommend denial of the second scheme. Ms. Voith stated that the third scheme was inferior from an urban planning point of view and also posed architectural and occupancy problems. She stated that the third scheme says; "I'll take my money and run." Mr. Sklaroff mentioned that occupancy was not an architectural concern and out of the Committee's scope of review. Ms. Voith disagreed. She mentioned that the building would be designed for the occupants and would therefore reflect the occupancy. Mr. Levy noted that he did not understand why the applicant could not design the revised, set-back tower as a condominium building. Mr. Turchi responded it was purely economics; a tower at the rear of the site could not be feasibly developed as a luxury condominium building.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee unanimously recommended denial of the demolition and new construction proposed in the current or second scheme. It declined to offer recommendations on the first and third schemes because they were not officially submitted as part of the current application.

ADJOURNMENT: The Architectural Committee adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Randal Baron
Jorge Danta
Jonathan E. Farnham
Karen Gonski