

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

**TUESDAY, 25 JUNE 2013
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Rudy D'Alessandro
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

Caroline Boyce, Preservation Alliance
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
David Yeager, Radnor Property Group
Joanne Phillips, Esq., Ballard Spahr
Michael Ytterberg, BLT Architects
Robert Graves, BLT Architects
Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker Partners
Brett Feldman, Esq., Klehr Harrison
Larry Weintraub, AIA
Charles J. Guinta
Joe Morrison, Beanlab
Andrew Kamins, Conservatory Group
Ian Cope, Cope Linder Architects
Evan Linnett
Michael Sklaroff, Esq.
Michael Kowlachick, M. Kowlachick Construction

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. McCoubrey called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Mses. Pentz and Stein and Mr. D'Alessandro joined him.

ADDRESS: 13-19 S 38TH ST AND 3723 AND 3725 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Construct mixed-use tower

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Episcopal Cathedral

Applicant: Robert Graves, BLT Architects

History: 13-19 S. 38th Street: 1855, Church of the Savior; Samuel Sloan, architect; enlarged and altered by Charles M. Burns, architect, 1889; rebuilt after fire by Charles M. Burns, architect, 1902-1906

Individual Designation: 5/7/1981

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Jon Farnham, jon.farnham@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes final approval of a project to construct a mixed-use tower and office building on a large site at the northeast corner of 38th and Chestnut Streets, adjacent to the Episcopal Cathedral. The Historical Commission approved the new construction portion of the project in concept in June 2012.

The site is comprised of several parcels. The Episcopal Cathedral is located at 13-19 S. 38th Street. The office building would be constructed at 3717-19 Chestnut Street, which is not designated as historic. The non-historic apartment building standing at 3717-19 Chestnut would be demolished. The tower would be constructed at 3723, 3725, and 3727-29 Chestnut Street. Two brownstone buildings, which are designated as historic and stand at 3723 and 3725 Chestnut Street, would be demolished. On 8 June 2012, the Historical Commission granted final approval of the demolitions of these buildings as necessary in the public interest. The demolition question has been decided and is not part of the current application. The parcel at 3727-29 Chestnut Street is vacant and is not designated as historic. The parcel at 3721 Chestnut Street is not owned by the Episcopal Cathedral, is not part of this project, and is not designated as historic. An apartment building stands on the 3721 Chestnut parcel.

The tower would house spaces dedicated to the cathedral as well as retail and residential spaces and would include underground parking. The office building would also include underground parking and would provide loading dock facilities for the complex. Both the tower and office building would connect to the cathedral building and provide support facilities for it.

The Historical Commission reviewed an earlier application for this project at its May and June 2012 meetings. At the June 2012 meeting, the Commission granted final approval to the demolitions of the buildings at 3723 and 3725 Chestnut Street. As part of that approval, the developer and Episcopal Cathedral have agreed to implement a plan to restore and maintain the cathedral building. The Commission will have opportunities to review the restoration and maintenance plans in the future. Also at the June 2012 meeting, the Commission approved the construction of the tower and office building in concept.

The current application proposes final approval of an updated design for the complex that was approved in concept in June 2012. The height, massing, volumes, footprint, and overall design are almost identical to those approved in concept. Since the in-concept approval, the design has been developed, especially with regard to the entrance at 38th Street to the cathedral's space in the tower, the connections between the historic cathedral and the new construction, and the location of the office building relative to Chestnut Street.

The design for the intersection of the cathedral building and the tower along 38th Street has been developed since the in-concept approval. Page 9 of the architectural plans depicts the revised design for the entrance at 38th Street to the cathedral's space in the tower.

The design of the glass circulation spine between the tower and the cathedral has also been improved. The structure is now cantilevered out from the tower, relieving the cathedral of any structural obligations for the new construction. The physical attachment of the old and new is dedicated solely to providing a weathertight connection. Also, the roof of the corridor has been pitched away from the cathedral to drain storm water away from the historic building. Additional information about stormwater management has been provided.

The elevation of the office building above the grade of Chestnut Street has been reduced, lowering the office building down toward Chestnut Street. This has two positive impacts. First, it simplifies the connection between the office building, cathedral, and tower, thereby greatly reducing the impact of the connection on the cathedral. The cuts into the side of the cathedral and the change to the roof pitch at the connection have been eliminated, leaving more of the cathedral undisturbed. Second, with the plaza lowered down toward Chestnut Street and the office building extended forward toward Chestnut Street, the office building is better connected visually and physically to the sidewalk, improving the pedestrian experience.

The design of the tower has been developed. Exterior materials, primarily metal panels and glass, have been selected. The design of the lower floors has been revised to give the building more of a base.

The Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia appealed the Historical Commission's approval of the demolitions of the buildings at 3723 and 3725 Chestnut Street to the Board of License & Inspection Review. The Board held hearings in late 2012 and early 2013, but the developer and the Alliance settled matter before the Board reached a decision. The Alliance agreed to drop its appeal and not oppose the project in exchange for more specificity from the developer regarding the proposal to restore and maintain the cathedral building and for a pledge from the Deputy Mayor and the Commission's executive director to propose that the Commission establish an ad hoc committee to review the Rules & Regulations as they relate to necessary in the public interest. That proposal will be formally submitted to the Commission in the near future. The proposals to restore and maintain the cathedral building will be reviewed by the Commission in the future as they are developed and implemented.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Final approval of the new construction application, pursuant to the Historical Commission's approval in concept of 8 June 2012 and the Standards cited therein.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developer David Yeager, attorney Joanne Phillips, and architects Michael Ytterberg and Robert Graves represented the application.

Ms. Phillips introduced the development team to the Committee. Mr. Ytterberg provided a brief overview of the project and then explained the refinements that had been made to the project since the Architectural Committee's last consideration of the design and the subsequent in-concept approval. He showed a rendering of the design approved in concept and then explained that the one-story base of the tower had been enlarged to two stories to better address the sidewalk and enhance the pedestrian experience on Chestnut Street. He pointed out that the garage entrance now has a glazed door. He reported that the overall design had been

enhanced considerably with changes to the location of the office building. The first floor of the office building is now about 18 inches above the grade of Chestnut Street, not several feet, making it more pedestrian friendly. Also, the front façade of the building has been moved forward toward Chestnut, reducing the size of the plaza and enhancing and enlivening the pedestrian experience. Mr. Ytterberg also explained that the lowering of the office building down toward the grade of Chestnut Street has also simplified and improved the connections between the tower, cathedral, and office building. The connection, a service corridor and a pedestrian corridor, have lowered in grade, reducing the impact on the cathedral. He stated that they are no longer proposing to alter the roof of the historic addition at the rear of the cathedral. With the changes in grade of the office building and the connecting corridors, the level of alteration to the cathedral has been reduced. The Committee members applauded this change, which minimizes the impacts to the historic building and improves the pedestrian experience along Chestnut Street.

Mr. Ytterberg displayed a series of materials samples. He showed tan and brown brick samples, which will be used for the office building. He pointed out on renderings where the various materials would be used. The Committee members concurred with the choices. He displayed four colors of metal panels and louvers that will be used for the tower and pointed out that the entrance to the cathedral space along 38th Street will be differentiated from the tower itself. He displayed a rendering of the west façade and pointed out where the various materials will be used. The Committee members concurred with the color choices for the metal panels and louvers. Mr. Ytterberg then displayed glass samples. He stated that the atrium connecting the tower to the cathedral will be glazed with a clear, low-reflectivity glass and the tower will be glazed with a similar glass with slightly more reflectivity. He stated that neither glass would be highly reflective like the Cira Center. He displayed a sample of the Cira Center glass for comparison with the glass for the atrium and the tower and noted the differences in reflectivity. The Committee members agreed with the glass choices.

Mr. Ytterberg presented the revised design for the atrium area, the glazed space that connects the tower to the cathedral. He noted that they have pushed the atrium back to the east to fully reveal the historic porch that projects off the southwest corner of the cathedral. They are proposing a garden along 38th Street in the setback area. The Committee members approved of this change. Mr. Ytterberg discussed the detail drawings for the connection of the atrium to the cathedral and for the storm water management at that connection. He explained that they have removed the columns that attached to the cathedral wall to support the atrium that were included in the in-concept design. He reported that the atrium roof is now entirely supported by the new building; the cathedral does not support any of the new construction. The attachment to the cathedral is merely to provide a water-tight connection. The Committee members stated that this change is a very positive improvement. Mr. Ytterberg also noted that they have replaced the gable roof of the atrium with a shed roof that slopes away from the cathedral. Therefore, no rain water from the tower will be diverted to the cathedral gutter, reducing the possibility of water damage to the historic building. The Committee members congratulated the applicants on the revisions. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he finds the revised design to be excellent in every regard but one. He pointed to Section Detail A on page 26 and asked if the ridge of the atrium roof could be reduced slightly in height, thereby improving views from the sidewalk to the side wall of the cathedral. Mr. D'Alessandro agreed and added that the reduction in height would allow the gutter between the cathedral and the atrium to be cleaned more easily. Mr. Ytterberg disagreed with Mr. D'Alessandro on the ease of cleaning the gutter and explained how the gutter could be cleaned. He added that he has discussed the issue of the height of the shed roof over the atrium with the Preservation Alliance and has agreed to study reducing its height. Ms. Stein

agreed with her colleagues that a reduction in height would improve the design. She also suggested removing the glass parapet at the 38th Street end of the atrium and allowing the end of the atrium to follow the diagonal profile of the shed roof of the atrium. Mr. Ytterberg responded that he would gladly reduce the height of the glass roof. He stated that he could bring it down to approximately align with the height of the cornice on the cathedral. He stated that he would not want to reduce the height such that the diagonal rafters of the shed roof would connect directly to the gutter beam, but he would be glad to reduce the height significantly. He explained that the gutter hangs from the cantilevered rafters. He stated that attaching the diagonal rafters directly to the gutter would look “ham-fisted.” Mr. D’Alessandro stated that he was not concerned with the interior appearance, but was only concerned with the exterior appearance. Mr. Ytterberg asked him to consider the experience of the users of the space as well as those on the exterior. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the reduction in height suggested by Mr. Ytterberg would be appropriate; he stated that the proposed design is an “elegant solution.” He agreed with reducing the height slightly, but not so much that the rafters would intersect directly with the gutter. Mr. McCoubrey asked Mr. Ytterberg to address the parapet at the end of the atrium. Mr. Ytterberg stated that he was opposed to removing the parapet at the end of the atrium and allowing the diagonal of the shed to appear on the end façade of the atrium. He stated that the composition of the façade at entrance into the cathedral space in the tower and at the end of the atrium was designed to be a “Mondrianesque composition” of right angles to distinguish it from historic cathedral, which is characterized by a series of diagonals formed by the many gable roofs. He asserted that it would be a mistake to introduce the diagonal into the atrium façade design, thereby corrupting the distinction between the new and old. He noted that the Architectural Committee had asked him to incorporate the square parapet during the in-concept review. He observed that some Committee members were now asking him to remove it, contradicting their earlier advice. He contended that it was important to the design to maintain the rectilinear nature of the new construction.

Caroline Boyce of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the proposed design is much improved over the in-concept design. She stated that she was pleased to hear that Mr. Ytterberg is receptive to reducing the height of the peak of the atrium roof. She stated that she looked forward to reviewing additional refinements as this project progressed.

Mr. Farnham noted that the applicants have expressed their willingness to study the two open design issues, the height of the atrium roof and the configuration of the end wall of the atrium. Mr. D’Alessandro opined that the Committee should recommend approval of the application, with the understanding that the staff would review the details related to the refinements to the atrium roof and end wall in light of the Committee’s comments. Mr. Yeager asked the Committee if it was requiring the removal of the so-called parapet at the end wall of the atrium. The Committee members responded and Mr. Ytterberg agreed that the Committee was requesting that Mr. Ytterberg restudy the intersection of the shed roof and end wall of the atrium. Mr. Farnham asked the Committee to clarify its suggested reduction of the height of the peak of the atrium roof. Messrs. McCoubrey and D’Alessandro pointed to Section Detail A on page 26 of the architectural drawings and stated that the peak of the roof should be lowered to approximately the location of the top of the cornice on the cathedral. Mr. Ytterberg promised to set the peak or ridge of the atrium roof below the top edge of the cathedral cornice. Mr. Yeager asked Mr. Ytterberg to confirm that the reduction was feasible and would not adversely impact the interior space. Mr. Ytterberg stated that he could drop the height to the compromise level requested by the Committee without adversely impacting the space. He stated that he could not drop it farther without harming the space. The Committee members agreed that the compromise reduction was sufficient. Mr. Ytterberg drew on a copy of the detail drawing to show the

proposed reduction. He and Mr. Graves pointed to a detail photograph on the plan to better illustrate what he was proposing. Mr. McCoubrey opined that the applicants had provided enough specificity for the staff to review the revised detail for compliance with the Committee's recommendation.

Mr. Farnham asked the Committee to clarify its position on the parapet shape, rectilinear or diagonal. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the parapet should be removed and the end wall should follow the triangular shape of the shed roof section. Mr. Ytterberg objected and again noted that he had added the rectilinear parapet last year at the insistence of the Committee and had then developed the overall entrance design based on that rectilinear shape. He contended that the rectilinear parapet was more appropriate to the overall entrance design. The square design allowed for a clear distinction between the rectilinear new building and the triangular, gabled, old building. Despite his objections, Mr. Ytterberg agreed to study the question and present the final details to the staff for its review. The Committee members agreed that the staff could review the revisions for approval in light of the Committee's comments.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval of the application, provided the height of the atrium as shown on pages 9 and 26 of the architectural drawings is reduced as discussed during the Committee's review, with the staff to review details.

ADDRESS: 269 S VAN PELT ST

Project: Construct addition and deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Melanie Amster

Applicant: Joseph Morrison, Beanlab LLC

History: 1870

Individual Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rooftop addition and deck on a two-story carriage house in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District. The proposed addition would be located towards the front of the building facing Van Pelt Street. The deck would be placed at the rear, away from Van Pelt Street. The addition is designed as a mansard with a centered wide dormer. The mansard would be clad in synthetic roof tiles with copper flashing and wood double-hung windows in the dormer. The sides of the mansard would be finished in stucco. The deck would be accessed by a set of sliding doors at the rear of the addition. The rear of the property has limited visibility and can only be seen obliquely from Manning Street. The Commission has approved several rooftop additions on this block of Van Pelt Street including a mansard addition on a similar carriage house a few doors to the north.

The application also proposes to replace all windows in the carriage house. The front façade windows would be replaced with double-hung wood windows. The windows at the rear of the property would be replaced with wood-clad casements. The windows at the rear are not visible from the public-right-of-way. As proposed, the replacement windows for the front façade would not replicate the original windows. One-over-ones are proposed. The historic windows were four-over-fours in the narrower openings. The center opening at the second floor was a hay door that has been converted to a window. The historic window in the center opening at the

second floor of the adjacent, nearly identical carriage house was a six-over-six, which would be an appropriate pane pattern for this window.

The carriage door and entrance door would be replaced with wood doors. Neither opening is original. The carriage door has been squared and widened. The entrance door was originally a window, but was cut down to a door. The façade was stuccoed. The proposed doors are appropriate for the non-original openings.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the pane configurations of the front windows match the historic configurations, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Brett Feldman and architect Joseph Morrison represented the application.

Mr. Feldman stated that his client recently purchased the property to be her family home. He explained that they had met with the staff before submitting the proposal. Mr. Feldman noted that he had received the staff's overview and recommendation before the meeting and that they were in agreement with replacing the windows to match the historic pane configurations. Mr. Feldman distributed revised elevation drawings that showed the revised pane configuration. He stated that the block was lined with rehabilitated former carriage houses and that this property awaited full rehabilitation. He stated that much work needed to be done in the interior to transform this carriage house into a family residence. Mr. Feldman explained that, in designing the addition, they were guided by precedents on the block and the district, specifically 247 S. Van Pelt Street, which was recently approved.

Ms. Stein asked if the applicant was in agreement with changing the windows to match the historic window pane patterns. Mr. Morrison answered that they were in agreement and pointed out to the revised elevations. She asked if the rear façade windows would also be changed to be more compatible with the historic windows. Mr. Morrison answered that they would not, since the rear façade has very limited visibility from the public way. He stated that their desire is to replace those rear units with aluminum-clad casements units. He reiterated that the revised pane pattern was only being proposed for the front façade, and that they would be matching the neighboring carriage house, which was originally identical to the subject property. Ms. Stein asked if the design for the person and garage doors were also based on historic evidence. Mr. Morrison answered that those openings had been altered from their original configurations and that they were proposing a design that would be compatible with the character of the property and also follow the precedent approved at 247 S. Van Pelt Street.

Ms. Stein pointed out that the corners of the mansard are treated in a very historicist manner and the detailing of the corners make it look like an original nineteenth-century mansard when compared to the mansard addition at 247 S. Van Pelt Street, which has straight corners and reads like a contemporary addition. She suggested that the corners be made straight to give the addition a more contemporary appearance. Mr. Morrison agreed and stated that he would change that detail as per Ms. Stein's suggestion. Mr. McCoubrey asked about the cladding material for the cheeks of the dormer. Mr. Morrison answered that they would be clad in copper.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the windows are replaced to match the original pane configurations, and the corners of the mansard are revised to eliminate the historicist detail.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JUNE 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

ADDRESS: 1835 PORTER ST

Project: Remove fence and wall, install parking pad

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Charles Guinta

Applicant: Lawrence Weintraub, Lawrence Weintraub AIA

History: 1907; John T. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Girard Estate Historic District, Contributing, 11/10/1999

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to create a parking pad for two cars in the rear yard of this corner property at 19th and Porter Streets. The property is located at the northern edge of the Girard Estate Historic District. The rear yard of the property faces Roseberry Street, which has the character of an alley. The few houses facing Roseberry Street are outside the district and are not designated as historic. The yard is currently enclosed on the side along 19th Street with a non-original wood fence in front of the original metal hair-pin fence. A non-historic concrete block wall stands at the rear along Roseberry. The entirety of the rear yard is paved with concrete.

The application proposes to create a curb cut on Roseberry Street and to remove the non-historic cement block wall to create an entrance to a parking pad on the existing concrete at the back half of the rear yard. The application also proposes to remove the concrete paving at the front half of the rear yard and plant grass.

Most of the houses along the north side of 1700 and 1800-blocks of Porter Street in the Girard Estate Historic District have rear-yard parking pads accessed from Roseberry Street. Since the establishment of the historic district, the Commission has approved two applications for the rear parking at these houses. It denied one application proposing parking at the rear, but the parking would have been accessed from 18th Street, not the alley-like Roseberry Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Lawrence Weintraub and home owner Charles Guinta represented the application.

Mr. Weintraub stated that since they submitted the application, they have discussed changing the design of the piers slightly. He explained that they would like to use a brick that would match the color of the bricks on the house, rather than a standard red brick, and to install a limestone cap with a lantern on each pier. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the bricks would be standard eight-inch bricks. Mr. Weintraub answered that they would be standard bricks. Ms. Stein asked if the color of the brick would be an exact match. Mr. Weintraub answered that it would be as close as possible. Ms. Stein asked if there would be any changes to the historic hair-pin fence along 19th Street or the non-historic wood fence in front of the hair-pin fence. Ms. Stein stated that removing or altering the wood fence would significantly enhance the historic qualities of the house. Mr. Weintraub stated that his client recently purchased the property and it came with the wood fence in place. He explained that current zoning requires a 42" fence along 19th Street and that the original hair pin fence is only 36". He also stated that his client would like to maintain the privacy that the wood fence provides for the backyard. He added that the fence would likely be repainted and repaired, but not removed or replaced with something else and it is not part of the current application.

Mr. McCoubrey asked if the new piers would be constructed without interfering with the existing hair-pin fence. Ms. Weintraub answered that they would. He explained that the piers would be located where the cement block fence currently stands. Mr. D'Alessandro asked about the height of the proposed pier. Mr. Weintraub answered that they would be four and a half feet tall. Mr. Weintraub stated that the lanterns would help to illuminate the back yard. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if they had a drawing to show the design of the pier and lantern. Mr. Danta stated that the staff could work with the applicant and approve the lantern at the staff level. Mr. McCoubrey agreed with Mr. Danta and stated that the staff could review the lantern details.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of revised design including lanterns on the piers, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 2109-11 WALNUT ST AND 2108-14 SANSOM ST

Project: Demolish non-contributing building, renovate buildings, construct nine townhouses

Review Requested: In Concept

Owner: Andrew Kamins/Conservatory Group USA

Applicant: Eric Leighton, Cecil Baker & Partners

History: 1950

Individual Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the redevelopment of a large parcel at the intersection of Van Pelt and Walnut Streets. The new parcel will consolidate several smaller parcels with varied improvements upon them and different classifications in the inventory of the Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District. The consolidated parcel will include 2108, 2110 and 2112-14 Sansom Streets as well as 2109 and 2111 Walnut Streets. Carriage houses stand on the parcels on Sansom Street. The properties at 2108 and 2112-14 are classified as Contributing to the historic district; 2110 is Non-contributing. The parcels on Walnut Street are occupied by a one-story commercial building and a surface parking lot, which are classified as Non-contributing. The application proposes the demolition of the Non-contributing commercial building and the construction of nine townhouses and the rehabilitation of the carriage houses on Sansom Street. No exterior work is proposed for the rehabilitation of the carriage houses.

The proposed townhouses are contemporary in style and would not replicate the historic Second-Empire townhouses that once stood on the site facing Walnut Street. The townhouses would be oriented towards the west and face Van Pelt Street, not Walnut, as the historic townhouses once did. They would be four stories tall and have projecting bays and complex massing. Parking would be accessed from Sansom and located at the rear of the townhouses. The parking would not be visible from the public-right-of-way.

The height of the new construction is appropriate to the district, as is the placement of garages at the rear of the properties. The orientation of the townhouse at the corner of Van Pelt and Walnut Street, however, is incompatible. The proposed development orients all townhouses to the west. This orientation places a secondary or side façade of the southernmost townhouse on Walnut Street, which is unquestionably one of the most important streets in the city. The proposed elevation along Walnut Street is mostly blank and accentuated by a projecting bay and a terrace at the second-floor. The lack of primacy and fenestration of the façade on Walnut

and the lack of engagement between the façade and the street is unsympathetic to the district and should be reconsidered.

The proposed cladding materials do not represent the palette of materials typically found in the historic buildings around the site. Instead, the proposed materials are contemporary in nature. The townhouses would be clad in a combination of glass, wood composite siding, fiber cement panels and cast stone veneers. The proposed materials are not inherently inappropriate to the district. However, the use of such diverse materials on the same elevation is not typical of the mostly late nineteenth-century streetscape in the 2100th block of Walnut Street. Most of the buildings around the site are clad in brick, brownstone, and sandstone. There are noted exceptions, such as the two-story limestone-clad commercial building at the northwest intersection of Van Pelt and Walnut Streets and the Mediterranean Revival townhouses on Van Pelt Street, but the majority of the built environment around the site is clad in masonry. The palette of materials should be restrained and masonry, not wood, should be emphasized to better integrate the new construction into its surroundings and the overall district.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the southernmost townhouse is redesigned to engage Walnut Street, and the palette of proposed materials is simplified with an emphasis of masonry over wood, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Andrew Kamins and architect Eric Leighton represented the application.

Mr. Leighton gave a brief presentation of the project. He stated that the existing historic properties on Sansom Street would be rehabilitated, but that at this time the exteriors of the properties would not be altered. He added that the proposal is to demolish the one-story non-contributing commercial building on Walnut Street and build townhouses on that lot and the adjacent surface parking lot. He clarified that the new construction would involve the removal of a non-historic addition at the rear of the corner building on Sansom Street. Mr. Leighton explained that parking for the new development would be at the rear of the property and that all garages would be accessed through Sansom Street. He noted that there is an existing driveway entrance that would be maintained as the access point for the entire development. Mr. Leighton distributed elevation drawings of the proposed townhouses, which were not included in the original submission. He noted that the elevations have more information on the proposed materials for the new construction. He showed the Committee members samples of the proposed materials for the new construction. He explained that the lighter cast stone material would be used as a base throughout the development and the darker fiber cement product would be used on the upper stories. He added that the darker paneled system was chosen to complement the historic brownstone facades on this block.

Ms. Stein asked if the supplemental drawings included any of the suggestions made by the staff in its recommendation. Mr. Leighton answered that the drawings did not include any of the staff's suggestions, and that they were just supplemental elevations of the design as submitted.

Ms. Pentz asked for clarification on the locations of the wood panels in the new construction. Mr. Leighton answered that the wood panels would be used in the projecting bays. Ms. Stein asked if the corner historic building on Sansom Street would be modified in order to transform it into a residential building. Mr. Leighton explained that the building was last used as an office. He clarified that all of the historic buildings on Sansom Street were converted into office spaces years ago. He stated that the proposal for the corner building would involve interior demolition

and complete rehabilitation of the interior. Ms. Stein asked if the exterior would change in any way. Mr. Leighton answered that the exterior would remain as is. Ms. Stein asked if the existing windows and doors would remain as they are. Mr. Leighton answered that as of now they would remain as they are. He added that the only possible exterior change might be a change to the primary entrance on the corner building, moving it from Sansom Street to an existing Van Pelt Street door. Ms. Stein suggested that some minor exterior changes would go a long way in enhancing the aesthetics of the historic buildings. Mr. Kamins explained that they are under agreement to purchase the property and are still within the due diligence period, which expires at the end of August. He stated that they expect to make changes to the scope of work once they move further into the design process and develop construction documentation. He reiterated that, for this review, the historic buildings would not be changed in any significant way. Ms. Stein stated that the project should have been submitted for conceptual approval, rather than final approval. Mr. Leighton explained that they had met with Mr. Baron prior to submitting the application and had discussed these possible changes with him. Mr. Leighton stated that they were advised at that time to submit for final approval, and that the staff could review and approve the details for changes to the historic carriage houses at a later date. He reiterated that the changes, if any, would involve the replacement of windows, garage doors, doors, and not the creation of new openings or other major alterations. Mr. Danta stated that he could not speak for Mr. Baron, but could say that any restoration work, such as the replacement of windows in historic openings, could be reviewed and approved at the staff level. Ms. Pentz asked if the existing white beltcourses that wrap around the facades of the historic buildings on Sansom Street would remain. Mr. Leighton answered that they would remain. He added that those beltcourses are not original and were likely added when the buildings were combined and rehabilitated into office space.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he agreed with the staff's suggestions regarding the use of materials and the lack of engagement with Walnut Street. He stated that, although he understood the desire on part of the architect to use wood as an accent piece, he was concerned with the impact it had on the overall design. He said that metal may be a more appropriate material. He added that wood is not typically seen in Philadelphia, which goes back to the days of William Penn and his experience with the great London fire. He stated that wood is fundamentally a non-Philadelphia building material. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the wall along Walnut Street could be revised to add more fenestration and engage Walnut Street. He encouraged the applicant to think of ways in which that elevation can be revised. Mr. D'Alessandro asked if the balconies would have flower boxes. Mr. Leighton answered that the balconies would have flower boxes along the railings. He added that several neighbors on the street keep beautiful window boxes and that flower boxes on the new townhouses would enhance the block along Van Pelt Street. Mr. Kamins stated that overall the concept has been to create a residential place along Van Pelt Street. He added that, although a mid-rise could have been built on the site, they felt that townhouses were best suited for the site and also more respectful to the urban fabric. He stated that this concept can still be achieved, while creating a more engaging presence along Walnut Street. He clarified that he was not opposed to the idea of revising the Walnut Street elevation, while still maintaining the main entrance on Van Pelt Street. Ms. Stein commended the applicants for their sensitive approach and the urbanistic qualities of the development, but stated that the details still needed refinement. Ms. Stein stated that she was in agreement with the staff that the Walnut Street elevation needed to be revised and that the proposed materials should also be reconsidered. She noted that the project is focused on Van Pelt Street, but that, given the significance of Walnut Street, it also needs to be addressed, especially as regards the treatment of the corner along Walnut Street. Ms. Stein suggested that

the historic buildings along Sansom Street could be better integrated into the development along Van Pelt. She reiterated that the exterior of those buildings should be improved.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the application lacked details and that it did not seem appropriate to review it for final approval without more clarity. Ms. Pentz asked if the applicants would object to changing the application from final approval to approval in concept. Mr. Kamins reiterated that they had submitted the application for final approval with the belief that the staff would review and approve the final details. Ms. Pentz explained that, if the application is reviewed in concept, the applicant would then return to the Committee and the Commission once they are ready to have the final scope and details of the project reviewed. She stated that a conceptual review focuses on the massing, density, and overall scope of the project, rather than specific details. Mr. Kamins stated that it would be necessary to know if the concept of the development is acceptable to the Commission in order for the purchase of the property to move forward. He stated that, at this point in time, it is more important to know that the massing and proposed demolitions are acceptable, rather than getting approval of design details and materials. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the demolition, redevelopment concept, and massing are all acceptable, but that the details should return to the Committee and Commission for further review. Mr. Danta asked Mr. Kamins if he was in agreement with changing the application from final review to conceptual review. Mr. Kamins answered that he agreed.

Caroline Boyce of the Preservation Alliance commended the applicant on the project. She stated that she was in agreement with all the comments stated by the Committee members and noted that the Alliance's greatest concern is the treatment of the Walnut Street elevation as currently proposed.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept, provided the Walnut Street elevation is revised and the proposed wood panels are changed to a more appropriate material, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 1632-38 DIAMOND ST

Project: Install telecommunications equipment

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Epiphany Fellowship

Applicant: Nicholas Cuce, Riley Riper Hollin & Colagreco

History: 1906; Bell Telephone Company; John T. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: 11/4/1982

District Designation: Diamond Street Historic District, Contributing, 1/29/1986

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install six antennas and associated equipment cabinets on the roof of this building. Four antennas would be mounted behind a stealth concealment wall, which would give the appearance of a brick penthouse. Two antennas would be mounted on the existing stairwell penthouse and would be painted to match. In addition, a backup generator would be located at grade at the southwest corner of the building and surrounded by a board-on-board fence.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Nicholas Cuce and Joel Defreytas represented the application.

Mr. Cuce explained that this proposal has been submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO). He stated that discussions with the Historical Commission staff and with the SHPO helped to determine a location of the equipment that minimized the visual impact. He stated that the equipment will not be visible. He showed the Committee an example of the stealth wall material as well as a photograph of a stealth wall used at Gwynedd-Mercy College. He stated that the stealth wall can be matched to the building. He stated that the material is fiberglass and the brick and mortar pattern and coloration the building can be imprinted on the material.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the existing antennas. Mr. Cuce stated that those were installed a few years ago with the Historical Commission's approval. He stated that those are not enclosed in the stealth material.

Ms. Stein observed that the new shadowbox fence would replace the stockade fence. She suggested that a stockade fence is preferable as it is simpler. Mr. Defreytas stated that they met on site with the staff to determine the visibility of the proposed alterations. He stated that the associated equipment will be located so as not to be visible. He stated that the idea for the stealth wall was offered during this discussion as well. Mr. Cuce stated that the antennas surrounded by the stealth wall are strategically placed to ensure clearance.

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

ADDRESS: 241 AND 243 S 07TH ST

Project: Enlarge and cut new window openings, install windows

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Evan Linnett

Applicant: Evan Linnett

History: 1963; Stonorov & Haws, architects

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Society Hill Historic District, Contributing, 3/10/1999

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to two adjacent townhouses to combine them into one residence. The buildings are located at the southeast corner of S. 7th Street and S. Washington Square. The front facades face S. 7th Street and the north or side façade of 241 faces the square. The buildings are part of a complex that includes rows of townhouses on S. 7th and Spruce Streets and the Hopkinson House tower on S. Washington Square. The complex was designed by the architectural firm of Stonorov & Haws and constructed in the early 1960s. With the exception of Louis I. Kahn, Oscar Stonorov was arguably the most prominent Modernist architect working in Philadelphia at the time. The complex was an important component of the Washington Square East or Society Hill redevelopment plan and the site's reuse was overseen by the Redevelopment Authority, which assembled the parcel and conveyed it to the developer with restrictions. The townhouses ring the tower at the south and west and provide a transition from the overtly Modernist tower to the surrounding low-scale eighteenth and nineteenth-century neighborhood. To effect this transition, the facades of the

townhouses have two personalities. The rears, which face Hopkinson House and its Modernist courtyard, are Modern in style. The front facades, which face older historic buildings, are traditional in style. The exposed side facades of the townhouses, of which there are three, were originally unfenestrated brick. The townhouses are classified as Contributing to the Society Hill Historic District.

The Modernist rears of the properties are visible from S. Washington Square. The rears of 241 and 243 S. 7th are essentially in their original conditions, except that the undivided, plate-glass, Modernist windows and doors in 241 were replaced with inappropriate small-paned Neo-Colonial windows and doors before designation.

The majority of the work proposed in this application would occur at the north or side façade, which faces Washington Square. Originally, the façade was unfenestrated brick. In 1971, two windows were cut into the façade, a small, single-light window at the first-floor east and a tall, narrow, projecting, prism window at the second and third-floor west. The two other exposed side façades in the complex, at 255 S. 7th Street and 637 Spruce Street, remain unaltered. This application proposes to remove both windows and significantly enlarge both openings, cut new openings, and install multi-light windows and doors, some with transoms and guard rails. With its extensive removal of brick and its replacement with glazing, the historic character of the side wall would be significantly diminished with the implementation of this proposal. Therefore, it fails to satisfy the Standards and Guidelines.

The application package includes copies of Stonorov's architectural drawings for a design for these townhouses that was not implemented. Reconstruction Standard 6 clearly states that "Designs that were not executed historically will not be constructed." Stonorov's unimplemented drawings shed no light on this review. The application package also includes images of large windows on buildings in the area surrounding these properties. Again, the Rehabilitation Standard 3 clearly prohibits drawing elements from unrelated buildings: "Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or *elements from other historic properties*, will not be undertaken." (italics added) The fact that nearby buildings have large windows has no bearing on this review.

The application proposes additional work to the exterior. It proposes to replace in kind the windows in the front facades; a rear door and transom; and the original pergola at the rear. No details are provided. The staff should review the details of these replacements to verify that they are, in fact, in kind.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of the reconstruction of the pergola and the replacement of the front windows and rear door, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6; denial of the alterations to the side or north façade at 241, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 9, and 10 and the Window Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Evan Linnett, attorney Michael Sklaroff, and architect Ian Cope represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that this property is contributing to the district. If the Historical Commission approves this proposal, the property will continue to contribute to the district. He stated that Mr. Cluver enforced this point when reviewing a similar proposal from this applicant last month by stating that the alteration might be acceptable when judged in the context of the entire district,

but not in relation to the building. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the resource to protect in this case is the district; the building is neither individually designated nor classified as significant in the district inventory. He noted that Stonorov's name is not even mentioned in the inventory for this row of buildings. He stated that this may not be his best work. He opined that the Hopkinson House is a good example of his work.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that the scale and the transition between the two styles, Modernist facing the Hopkinson House and the Neo-colonial facing 7th Street, are the characteristics that make this building contributing. He pointed out that the as-built buildings do not follow Stonorov's original plans, which called for a purely Modernist building. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the blank wall was breached in 1971 with the current windows, which are anomalous. He stated the only good thing about the existing windows is that they do not try to imitate the Modernist or Neo-colonial. However, they are incoherent in design. He stated that this is the only building on Washington Square that has inappropriate windows. He stated that the proposed solution is to bring life to the building and the rooms within, to have eyes on the square, but eyes that make sense. Mr. Sklaroff stated that this wall was originally a transition, a blank wall that speaks to neither the Modernist nor Neo-colonial. He stated that the proposed windows do not pretend to be anything they are not. They are neither Modernist nor Neo-colonial. They are contemporary. He stated the the new windows seem to be a reasonable solution that does not detract from the contributing nature of the building. He opined that this type of fenestration is typical of Washington Square. He stated that it will show well on the square as it shows that there is life in the building, it is inhabited, and it will be lit at times.

Mr. Sklaroff asserted that the Standards that the staff referenced would apply strictly if the building was individually designated or classified as significant to the district. He stated that, when reviewing proposals to a contributing building, the review should ascertain whether the improvement impairs the contributing nature of the building and should not be concerned with the purity of the building, especially in this instance when the building has a split personality. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the owner is willing to restore the rear openings to their original Modernist design.

Mr. McCoubrey asked how the proposal has changed since the review last month. Mr. Cope described the changes by stating that the head of the large window on the western end has been dropped down to show more masonry. Mr. Cope stated that they walked around the square and saw many large openings. He stated that they tried to determine the ratio of masonry to openings and noted that it varies, but usually it is about 60 percent masonry to 40 percent openings. He stated that windows are sometimes irregular and unordered and sometimes fairly consistently ordered. He stated that the existing condition is an anomaly on Washington Square. He noted that they reduced the scale of the windows as well. The first proposal had two narrower windows on the first floor, but now it is one larger window, and the double-height window has been reduced in size. Mr. Cope noted that the double-height window relates to the double-height space within. He stated that the brick will not be cut but will be toothed in. Mr. Sklaroff added that the proposal does not copy the Farm Journal Building on the square, but the quantity of panes is similar to the windows in that building.

Ms. Pentz asked about the recommendation for the previous proposal. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the recommendation was for denial, but noted that the Committee applied the Standards literally as if this building were classified as significant. Ms. Pentz stated that she appreciated Mr. Sklaroff's explanation regarding the context of the district. He reiterated that this building's main role is to contribute to the district. Mr. Linnett stated that the last review was difficult because no

one had a clear vision for this wall because the building is Modern in the rear and traditional in the front and they could not develop a consensus.

Ms. Cote stated that the Historical Commission reviews proposals to non-contributing properties, weighing the proposals effect of the district; when reviewing proposals to contributing properties, the Commission looks at the effect not only on the district as a whole but on the property as well. She stated that, with significant properties, Commission strictly applies the Standards. Mr. Sklaroff stated that, in all fairness, generally, the Commission has treated contributing buildings as if they are significant. He contended that that was not the correct approach. He stated that, even in this instance, if you applied the higher standard, the proposal does not detract from the building; it improves the building. He opined that the existing windows are inappropriate. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that they are not in a position to start reinterpreting the earlier decision. Mr. Sklaroff stated that removing the existing, non-historic windows would improve the building.

Ms. Cote stated that the staff is not opposed to any window cuts in the wall. She stated that the staff views the window cuts as proposed as very extensive. Ms. Stein concurred. She stated that the issue lies with the character and placement of the windows as they are proposed. She stated that she sees the deck and the solid brick end wall as part of that transition between the styles at the front and back facades. She stated that new windows could be appropriate. She stated that the window pattern in the proposal is not well developed. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the end wall is neither Modern nor Neo-colonial. Mr. McCoubrey pointed out that the end wall had a strong presence, owing to the brick. Mr. Sklaroff stated that there is no question that this proposal would result in a change to the end wall. He opined that the proposal is an improvement over the current appearance of the wall. He stated that there is also an interest in allowing the owner to have the benefit of the full use of the property.

Mr. Farnham stated that he did not agree with all of Mr. Sklaroff's statements in regards to the lower standards for contributing buildings. He stated that the level of alteration falls within the discretion of the Commission to approve, if it so chooses. He stated that he did not think that the Committee was legally bound to apply the Standards absolutely strictly. He stated that the Committee should strike a balance between the changing needs of the property owner and the preservation needs of the public. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the owner has offered to restore the Modernist fenestration at 241. Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission could not compel the owner to make that change as it was grandfathered in at the time of designation, but the offer did make the proposal more appealing. He stated that it is desirable to have consistency along the rear of this row.

Ms. Pentz stated that she believes that this proposal would improve the building for the owner, the square, and the district. She stated that she would be open to recommending approval of the design as submitted, especially with the restoration of the rear.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that the size, placement, and the design of the windows as proposed are troubling. He stated that the windows with the balconies have a Victorian feel and the multi-paned casement windows have a Gothic approach. He stated that this wall should have its own character and not simply be a mix of the two other facades. Mr. Cope suggested that it should have a third personality. Mr. McCoubrey asserted that the wall as proposed has a split personality. He stated that the wall is powerful because it faces the square. He stated that he would like to see a design that shows more of a sense of the wall. Mr. Cope stated that they felt uncomfortable with designing smaller windows that are akin to those found on 7th Street. He

stated that they really see this wall as a transition between the two styles. He stated that, as proposed, the wall would have a good deal of masonry; it would be 60 percent masonry and 40 percent openings. He opined that “potty” little windows would not be appropriate.

Mr. D’Alessandro suggested reducing the size of certain windows and changing the placement and pane pattern. He asked if they could accept two openings. Mr. Cope stated that there are two openings now. He stated that the living space wants to address and be orientated towards the square and that is what the proposal is trying to do. Mr. D’Alessandro stated that he was trying to address the masonry wall, not the living space. He stated that his biggest problem with the proposal is that it is proposing too much removal of masonry. Ms. Pentz asked if the transoms are needed. Mr. Cope stated that they are not; however, they are proposed for the verticality of the door. He stated that without the transoms they will look “potty.”

Mr. D’Alessandro suggested the the Committee can recommend approval of expanding the two-story window; they only need to determine an appropriate amount of cutting. Mr. Sklaroff stated that their intent is to bring the building to life for the home owner and to show warm and friendly windows to the square. He suggested that the question should be: Does this proposal detract from the contribution of the bulding to the district? He stated that the proposal brings light to the square, honors the surroundings, and removes the unappealing existing windows. He stated that, in addition, the owner is willing to restore the rear of 241.

Ms. Stein stated that, in her view, the end wall as proposed does detract. She stated that Stonorov designed the wall as a brick transition between the Modern and the Neo-colonial. She stated that the proposal does non make that transition. She stated that the amount of masonry being removed is excessive and does not allow it to make that transiton that is important. Mr. Sklaroff argued that the proposal is a transition as there is no mimicry of either the Modernist windows or the Neo-colonial. He stated that the proposal is a transition that is different from the brick end wall, but a transition none the less, and it will still contribute to the district. Ms. Stein disagreed. Mr. Sklaroff asked if the Juliet balconies were an issue. Ms. Stein stated the Committee was opposed to the balconies last month and still is. Mr. Sklaroff stated that Juliet balconies can be removed from the proposal.

Ms. Stein recommended that the applicant develop a row of smaller scale windows on the first floor to enliven the experience for the pedestrian. She suggested that something else could happen above, such as an enlarged bay window that is a counterpoint to the deck at the rear. She suggested avoiding the four-square window pattern as it does not suit an asymmetrical gable wall. Mr. Sklaroff asked if she is suggesting removing the bedroom window from the proposal. Ms. Stein stated that that the bedroom already has a window at the rear. Mr. D’Alessandro stated that the big window alone would work. He stated that the samller window below as proposed weakens it. Ms. Stein also suggested staggering windows. Mr. Sklaroff stated that they could talk with the staff to make any revisions to the proposal between now and the Commission meeting.

Caroline Boyce of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia stated that the Alliance concurs with the staff’s recommendation. She stated that she was concerned about the discussion regarding lower standards for contributing buildings. She stated that a district is a collection of buildings. She stated that this type of building is recognized in the nomination. She stated that the fact that Stonorov’s name was not mentioned in the inventory is irrelevant. She advised the Committee and Commission that they should not let the interior design drive the exterior. Mr. Sklaroff stated that the interior is important to owners and to all of us, as form

follows function. He stated that this building was classified as contributing even with these anomalous windows from the 1970s. He stated that, in essence, a building could be contributing even if the windows are inappropriate. He stated that the proposal is an improvement. Mr. Sklaroff stated that it is telling that Stonorov's name was not mentioned in the inventory. Ben Leech of the Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia noted that Stonorov's name is mentioned in the section on the Spruce Street section of the development, which is identical to the 7th Street section. Mr. Sklaroff stated that it was not mentioned for this row on 7th Street.

Ms. Pentz stated that she was still in favor of the proposal.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the reconstruction of the pergola and the replacement of the front windows and rear door, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6; denial of the alterations to the side or north façade at 241, pursuant to Standards 2, 3, 5, 9, and 10 and the Window Guidelines.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:20 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 3: Each property will be recognized as a physical record of its time, place, and use. Changes that create a false sense of historical development, such as adding conjectural features or elements from other historic properties, will not be undertaken.

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

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

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

Window Guidelines: Not Recommended: Removing or radically changing windows which are important in defining the historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is

diminished; Changing the number, location, size or glazing pattern of windows, through cutting new openings, blocking-in windows, and installing replacement sash that do not fit the historic window opening; Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of the glazing; or the appearance of the frame.