

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

**TUESDAY, 23 AUGUST 2011
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, Chair
Rudy D'Alessandro
Shawn Evans
Nan Gutterman
Suzanne Pentz

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

Jessica Anders
Dave Foberg
Eric Quick, Harmon Deutsch Architects
Craig Deutsch, Harmon Deutsch Architects
Gail Selznick, The Bourse
Robert Gilberg, The Bourse
Kevin J. O'Neill, KJO Design & Planning
Jean McCoubrey, Runyan & Associates
Martin Lohrmann, Christ Ascension Lutheran Church

CALL TO ORDER

Ms. Hawkins called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Mses. Gutterman and Pentz and Messrs. D'Alessandro and Evans joined her.

ADDRESS: 2047 SPRUCE ST, UNIT 5

Project: Legalize deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Jessica Anders

Applicant: Jessica Anders

History: 1883; Hewitt Brothers, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District, Significant, 2/8/1995

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the reconstruction of a roof deck. A roof deck was present at the time of designation of the Rittenhouse Fitler Residential Historic District in 1995. The property was not individually designated prior to the creation of the district. The original deck was constructed in 1985 and a building permit was approved for its construction at that time. The current deck, however, does not match the design of the one present at the time of designation. The railing has been changed from a light metal railing to a heavy pressure-treated lumber railing. The dimensions and location of the deck appear to be the same. The railing of the deck is highly visible from Spruce Street as well as the western corners of this intersection.

This house is one of four distinctive and significant Victorian mansions that stand at the intersection of Spruce and 21st Street. The Commission reviewed several applications for the construction of a roof deck on the house directly to the south of the subject property in 2005. The Commission denied a conspicuous deck proposal and approved a much smaller deck instead. The Commission has not approved conspicuously visible decks on mansard roofs in the past. Corner properties with mansard roofs are especially problematic for appropriate deck installation owing to their wide angles of exposure to the public-right-of-ways. Although the deck was present at the time of designation, it lost its grandfathered status when it was removed. A reconstructed deck does not have the grandfathered status.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and Roofs Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Jessica Anders and Dave Foberg represented the application.

Mr. Danta explained that the applicant had submitted supplemental information regarding the material of the railings that were removed. The owner submitted a home inspection report that clarified that the railings that were removed recently were wood and not metal. The metal railing that appears in the 1995 designation photograph was replaced years ago.

Ms. Anders related the sequence of events that led to the reconstruction of the deck. She explained that the roof had a major leak and that, originally, the contractor was going to remove only enough boards from the decking to access the problem area on the roof. The contractor advised Ms. Anders to replace the entire decking and railing because the existing structure was rotted and the railing was not up to code. The contractor replaced the deck and installed a code-compliant railing. Ms. Anders expressed her desire to work with the Commission to find a resolution. She noted that it was not her intention to circumvent the Commission's process.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the grandfathered condition of the earlier deck and if it had any ramifications for the newly constructed deck. Mr. Danta answered that, if the earlier deck, which

was grandfathered, would have been repaired, then the Commission would have been obliged to allow the property owner to retain it. However, the grandfathered deck was not repaired; it was demolished and a new deck rebuilt. The new deck does not have the same grandfathered status. Mr. Danta stated that the main issue was not the existence of the deck on the roof, but its visibility. He asked if there was any way the railing could be pushed back further onto the roof to minimize its visibility. Ms. Anders answered that the access from the roof hatch to the deck was along the edge of the roof and that there was no feasible way of creating a new access path. She noted that the deck is surrounded by a skylight and HVAC units.

Ms. Anders acknowledged that the deck is visible from the street, but asserted that it is no more conspicuous than it was before it was rebuilt. The deck was not enlarged or changed in any other way. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee tries to be consistent and abide by the rules closely. She noted that the deck as proposed does not meet several preservation standards.

Ms. Anders suggested replacing the existing wood railing with a cable railing system in order to minimize the visibility of the railing. Mr. Evans noted that, if the roof was flat, it would be easier to minimize the visibility. He explained the complexities of a roof deck on a mansard. He also noted that designation photograph shows a railing that was different from the railing extant at the time the home owner's report was done. Mr. Danta agreed and stated that the staff believes that the railing at the time of designation was metal and not wood. Mr. Evans observed that a neighbor's railing has also been changed since the time of designation. Ms. Anders noted that the deck had a wooden railing when she purchased the house as shown by the home inspection report. Ms. Anders stated that she is trying to adhere to the historic preservation regulations without breaking the bank. She noted that she is concerned about the possible cost of the alteration, specifically changing the railing.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the simple pickets shown in the designation photograph are spaced too far apart and would not satisfy today's building code. She stated that, once the pickets are placed at four inches on center, then the railing would become much more visible than as shown on the designation photograph. The metal railing in the photograph also did not seem to address the elevation difference between the access point around the hatch and the deck itself.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee could not recommend approval for a situation that they would not endorse if it had come to them prior to construction. She stated that the similar proposals have been consistently denied. Ms. Anders stated that the deck was permitted and had received a zoning variance. Mr. Danta stated that the deck that was permitted and constructed has been removed. He said that the zoning variance plays no role in the Historical Commission's review.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that some mock ups be installed to devise a railing with minimal visibility. She noted that a thin metal picket railing may work, even if spaced at four inches on center. Mr. Evans agreed with Ms. Gutterman. Ms. Hawkins clarified that the key would be to make all the elements of the railing thin and inconspicuous. She stated that reducing the massing of the railing would go a long way at addressing the visibility of the railing. Mr. Evans clarified that the Committee was not recommending approval, but was merely offering a suggestion on how to mitigate the illegal condition.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the application to legalize the roof deck, pursuant to Standards 2 and 9 and Roofs Guidelines.

ADDRESS: 219-29 S 18TH ST, UNIT 1106

Project: Install roof decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Adam Shapiro

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch

History: 1925; Penn Athletic Club, Parc Rittenhouse; Zantzinger, Borie & Medary, architects;alts, Cronheim & Weger, architects, 1957

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District, Contributing, 2/8/1995

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Jorge Danta, jorge.danta@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of two decks on existing terraces. The terraces face Rittenhouse Square and are located at the southwest and northwest corners of the building. The terraces have generous parapet walls. The level of the living space to which the decks would connect is much higher than the level of the terraces. The architect proposes to install the decks to match the level of the apartment and step them down to meet the parapet. The north deck, however, would not be brought down enough to use the existing parapet as a railing. The design proposes the installation of metal railings in addition to the existing parapets at the north terrace. The proposed railing is described in the application as "clear vinyl coated stainless steel cable railing." The angles of visibility and the height of the terraces would make the railings inconspicuous. The public may see the railings, but at a great distance. The decks would not be conspicuous.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and Roofs Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architects Craig Deutsch and Erik Quick represented the application.

Mr. Deutsch stated that railings would be installed at the north terrace only. He explained that the parapet would be sufficient for most of the terrace area because they are creating a green buffer; users of the deck would not be able to get close to the parapet. He noted that the proposed design meets all building codes and railing height requirements.

Ms. Gutterman stated that she believed that the railing would be visible. Mr. Danta noted that the staff believes the railing would be visible, but not conspicuous. Ms. Hawkins asked why the railing could not be installed inboard of the planting beds to minimize its visibility. Mr. Deutsch acknowledged that it could but that the access to the plants for maintenance would be very cumbersome. Ms. Gutterman stated that a railing could be designed that would allow access to the plants.

Mr. Evans pointed out that the hot tub area is higher than it needs to be, thus making the railing more visible. Mr. Deutsch answered that the proposed design is the most logical from the user's point of view.

Ms. Gutterman suggested that mock ups be installed to gauge the visibility of the railings from the square. Ms. Gutterman clarified that the mock ups should be installed on both terraces, even though the railings at the north terrace would likely be more visible. The other Committee members agreed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided a mock up demonstrates that the railings would not be visible.

ADDRESS: 1915 NORTH ST

Project: Demolish garage building and construct building with garage and roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: James Burton

Applicant: Kevin J. O'Neill, KJO Design & Planning

History: after 1922, probably 1934

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, No Classification, 10/11/2000

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Randal Baron, randal.baron@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the demolition of a single-story garage and the construction of a three-story house with a garage.

The Commission may approve the demolition of a contributing property in a historic district only if it finds of the demolition is necessary in the public interest or if the forced retention of the building would constitute a financial hardship for the owner. Complicating this application, it appears that this property was not classified in the district inventory. However, it also appears that the garage has no historical significance. It appears that it was constructed in 1934, when the Transportation Materials Company moved into the building at 1916 Fairmount Avenue.

The inventory of the Spring Garden Historic District contains significant errors for this section of North Street. It lists properties at 1913-15 and 1917-19 North Street. However, at the time of designation and currently, what would have been 1913 North was and is the rear of 1914 Fairmount Avenue; 1915 North was and is a separate property; 1917 North was and is a separate property; and 1919 North did not and does not exist. The property in question is described as part of 1917-19 North Street even though it was and is a separate property at 1915 North. The description for 1917-19 North Street contains other errors as well; for example, in addition to the fact that 1919 does not exist, it calls out a storefront, but the rowhouse at 1917 did not and does not have a storefront. The property at 1917-19 North Street, into which the garage was wrongly lumped, is classified as contributing. However, owing to the inventory errors, one can assume that 1915 North, the property with the garage, has no classification, allowing the Commission to approve the demolition of the garage without a finding of necessity in the public interest or hardship. However, because the property was not undeveloped at the time of designation, the Commission has plenary jurisdiction over the construction.

The application proposes two alternative designs. Option A is more traditional with punched openings; Option B is more contemporary with larger openings. The staff prefers Option A because it is more compatible with the architecture, rhythms, proportions, scale, and materials of the streetscape. However, the staff recommends modifying Option A, adjusting the proportions of the garage door, and replacing the stylistically inappropriate six-panel door and six-over-one windows with a four-panel door and two-over-two windows. Also, the façade, door, window, lintel, sill, watertable, and cornice materials and details should be specified and appropriate. More information about the roof deck should also be provided.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of Option A, provided the suggested revisions are made, with the staff to review material samples and other details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Kevin J. O'Neill and Benjamin Cole represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the applicants have revised the design based on the staff's comments. He stated that the applicants have incorporated the changes suggested by the staff. He stated that the staff would generally recommend approval of this design.

Mr. Baron explained that this property was mistakenly not classified in the district inventory. He noted that he visited the site and observed that the garage is neither old nor well built. Many of the older pieces of the garage have been replaced with newer, inappropriate pieces, further devaluing it. Mr. Baron concluded that it should be considered non-contributing to the district.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the materials of the windows. Mr. O'Neill replied that they would be vinyl. Mr. Baron responded that vinyl windows are not appropriate for the historic district. Ms. Gutterman asked about the proposed cornice material. Mr. O'Neill replied that they want to construct it of Azek or Fypon. He stated that the façade would be constructed of real brick, not a brick veneer or tile.

Mr. Evans noted that the cornice of the building to the east returns around the corner, wrapping onto the side of the building and onto this property. He asked how the applicants would handle this condition. Mr. O'Neill stated that they would work with the neighbor and match their cornice line height to the neighbors. Mr. Evans noted that that implies removing the return.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the set back of the deck from the front façade. Mr. O'Neill stated that it would be set back 10 feet from the front façade. He stated that he would prefer a parapet wall, not a railing. Ms. Gutterman stated that she preferred a metal railing, not a parapet.

Ms. Hawkins about the door materials. Mr. O'Neill responded that they would like to use steel doors for the front entry and the garage. Ms. Gutterman asserted that a steel entry door was not appropriate to the historic district. Mr. Baron explained that one could not manufacture a steel door with the proposed panels. Mr. O'Neill suggested a fiberglass door. Mr. Baron stated that he would need to review the specifications for a fiberglass door to verify that it had the appropriate appearance. Mr. Cole stated that they would be willing to install a wood door. Ms. Gutterman explained that the Committee must ascertain whether the proposal is appropriate for the district. Ms. Hawkins observed that the overall design, as revised, is appropriate for the district. However, some details still need to be worked out. She summarized that the deck railing at the front should be metal, perhaps with a return along the sides, vinyl windows are not appropriate, the front door should be wood, and the garage door may be a material other than wood. Messrs. O'Neill and Cole stated that the colors shown in the plans are not entirely accurate. Ms. Hawkins stated that the applicants could work with the staff on these types of details.

Mr. D'Alessandro inquired about the curb cut. Mr. Cole explained that the existing curb cut is almost as wide as the building. He stated that they will repour the concrete sidewalk with a standard curb cut.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the windows are not vinyl, the front door is wood, and any visible portions of the deck railing are metal, with the staff to review details including material choices and colors.

ADDRESS: 2031 GREEN ST

Project: Construct elevator tower, addition, and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Matthew Van Wollen

Applicant: Frank Reis, Walnut Tree Construction

History: 1859

Individual Designation: 5/1/1975

District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an elevator tower and a one-story addition with a patio and ramp in an open area along the rear ell. The open area was created when the building to the east was demolished many years ago. The east wall of 2031 Green Street is an exposed party wall. The wall is stuccoed with a white sand finish. The open space is now used for parking.

The elevator tower would stand three stories tall along the east party wall. Until recently, a non-historic stair tower stood in the location now proposed for the elevator tower. The stair tower appears in March 2009 aerial photographs. At some point after March 2009, the stair tower was demolished without a building permit or the Commission's approval.

The new elevator tower would be clad in stucco to match the existing party wall. The one-story addition would be constructed behind the elevator shaft and would extend across the open area to the west wall of the neighboring property. The addition would also be clad in stucco to match the existing building. A rear patio would be constructed behind the addition. A ramp would be installed at the front of the addition. The addition would be inconspicuous from the public right-of-way. It would set back from the street and behind garage doors that run along the sidewalk. The elevator tower would be visible but inconspicuous over the garage doors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. Evans asked about the former non-historic stair tower on the party wall, which was present in the designation photograph, but later demolished. Ms. Sell stated that the Commission has no record of its demolition. It can be seen in the designation photograph for the property, but is gone in a photograph submitted with a recent application to replace the parking gates. Mr. Evans asked if the proposed rear terrace would be exposed to the rear alley. Ms. Sell confirmed that the terrace would not be visible because of an existing rear wall. Ms. Gutterman asked if the existing tree would be retained. Ms. Sell responded that she did not know, but the plans do not show retention of the tree. Ms. Gutterman asked if windows are proposed for the elevator shaft as shown in the rendering. Ms. Sell responded that she does not know because the window details were not provided. The Committee members decided that the proposed alterations are acceptable because they involve a non-historic portion of the building and would be inconspicuous from the street.

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

ADDRESS: 111 S INDEPENDENCE E ML, UNIT A

Project: Legalize banners

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Bourse Mall Associates, LP

Applicant: Robert E. Gilberg, Bourse Mall Associates, LP

History: 1893; Philadelphia Bourse Building; Hewitt Brothers, architects

Individual Designation: 1/26/1971

District Designation: Old City Historic District, Significant, 12/12/2003

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of four banners and brackets along the Independence Mall and 4th Street elevations of the Bourse building. The brackets are mounted to brownstone façade, between two fluted pilasters and over two bands of rustication, with several bolts. The banners are 24 feet tall and made of a vinyl material.

The applicant claims the brackets and several iterations of banners have been in place at this location since the 1980s. It appears that the Historical Commission did not approve the banners and brackets and the Department of Licenses & Inspections did not issue a permit for them. In December 2010, the Department issued a violation for the signage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, unless documentation is provided showing that the banners were approved and permitted, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner's representatives Gail Selznick and Robert Gilberg represented the application.

Mr. Gilberg stated that he researched various city repositories for the permits and could not locate them. Ms. Selznick added that they combed through their own archives and could not locate them there either. Mr. Gilberg asserted that they have learned to keep better records of approved permits in the future.

Ms. Pentz asked if this was related to an application for the reinstallation of the rooftop signage, which also lacked the appropriate permits. She noted that the Committee had recommended denial and the application was withdrawn prior to the Commission meeting. Mr. Gilberg explained that he knows they had permits for the rooftop signage, but could not locate those. However, he added that he is not clear that the banners were appropriately permitted in the 1980s.

Mr. Evans asked about the material of the brackets, which is not noted on the plans. Mr. Gilberg stated that they are wrought iron. Some Committee members disagreed, suggesting that they are likely steel.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Commission has denied applications for similar signage proposals on neighboring buildings that face Independence Mall, namely the Hotel Monaco and Lights of Liberty buildings. She acknowledged that devising appropriate signage would be a challenge for this building. She also noted that it is important for tourists to easily find its location along the Mall. Ms. Gutterman agreed that the Committee and Commission have set a precedent for denial of this type of signage at this location.

Mr. Evans acknowledged that he has seen the banners for two decades. He opined that these particular banners do not appear to be inappropriate on this building, whereas other proposals for other buildings in this area were excessive in their locations. Ms. Hawkins added that the Bourse building is not adjacent to Independence Hall, which may allow the Commission to be flexible. Mr. Gilberg stated that he has contacted the National Park Service about the banner installation and, while it has not issued a consent letter, it is also not asking that they be removed.

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

ADDRESS: 8300 GERMANTOWN AVE

Project: Install ADA accessible entrance and ramp

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Christ Ascension Lutheran Church

Applicant: Jean McCoubrey, Runyan & Associates Architects

History: 1870; Christ Ascension Lutheran Church and Parish House; Charles M. Burns, architect

Individual Designation: 8/2/1973

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes two schemes to create ADA access for the church. Scheme A proposes to cut a simple squared opening at the rear of the sanctuary. A concrete walk would lead from the driveway to the opening. Scheme B proposes to cut an opening in the side wall of the church. This would involve removing the lower portion of one stained glass window and leaving the top arch of the window to serve as a transom over the new door. A concrete ramp would curve from driveway and lead to the new entrance. The ramp sidewall would be clad in schist.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of Scheme A, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jean McCoubrey and Rev. Martin Lohrmann represented the application.

Ms. McCoubrey explained the two options to the Committee. She stated that Scheme A requires the removal of less material, will be less of an intrusion to the elevation, and will cost less than Scheme B. However, Scheme B would lead users into the rear of the sanctuary, the appropriate entry point, and would cause less interference with the interior layout of the pews. Ms. Pentz asked if there was a basement. Rev. Lohrmann replied that there is a basement under the sanctuary. Ms. McCoubrey informed the Committee that they looked into possibly providing the ADA access at front entrance or leading up from W. Southampton Street, but these options were not feasible. Ms. Hawkins asked if the church had a preference. Rev. Lohrmann responded that the church would accept either scheme; both have pros and cons. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he thought that either scheme would be appropriate. Ms. Pentz concurred.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of both Schemes A and B, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 110 QUEEN ST

Project: Install weatherproofing on façade

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Sarah Paterson

Applicant: Sarah Paterson

History: 1830

Individual Designation: 6/24/1958, 5/31/1966

District Designation: None

Preservation Easement: No

Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to treat the side brick wall of this row house with a water-repellent chemical called Siloxane PD. The interior of the home is experiencing water damage. It has been the experience of the Commission that liquid water does not move through two wythes of bricks. Most likely, the water infiltration is occurring at the roofing, flashing, barge board, or chimney. The applicant claims that the bricks are cracking and spalling. However, the photographs appear to indicate the expected condition of a 180-year-old wall. Cracking and spalling result from hard mortar joints. The appropriate solution for cracking and spalling is to cut out and re-point the wall.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 7.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman concurred with the staff recommendation. She stated that applying a water repellent to the brick will not provide a solution to the spalling of the brick; it does not glue the bricks in place. She explained that, if water is really a concern on interior, then the applicant would need to provide supporting documentation showing moisture on the inside face of the outside wall, mapping it over a period time. She stated that, if the documentation indicates that there is in fact water infiltration through the brick, then the Commission can consider the repellent at that time. Mr. Evans suggested that, if the brick is spalling results from hard mortar, then the repellent will simply spall off along with it. The Committee members agreed that it was very unlikely that the repellent would solve the water infiltration problem. They suggested that the applicant investigate other sources of the water at the roof and chimney.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 7.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:45 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.

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.

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.