

**THE MINUTES OF THE 582<sup>ND</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE  
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**11 FEBRUARY 2011  
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET  
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

**PRESENT**

Sam Sherman, Chair  
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.  
Susan O.W. Jaffe  
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President  
John Mattioni, Esq.  
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department  
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections  
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission  
Joan Schlotterbeck, Department of Public Property  
Robert Thomas  
Jo Ann Jones, Office of Housing & Community Development  
Miles Wilson

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

**ALSO PRESENT**

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia  
Josh Lewis  
Heather McLeod, CBRC  
Gary Brent  
Jeff Dickinson, Icon Identity Solutions  
Amy Johnston, Mural Arts Program  
Adam Montalbano, Moto Design Shop  
David Watt  
Lorna Katz-Lawson, Society Hill Civic Association  
Ed Chacker  
Gary Martin, William Proud Masonry

**CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Jaffe, Jones, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Quinn, Schaaf, Schlotterbeck, Thomas, and Wilson joined him.

**SELECTION OF VICE CHAIR**

**ACTION:** Mr. Sherman moved to select Sara Merriman as the vice chair of the Commission. Mr. Quinn seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

## **MINUTES OF THE 581<sup>ST</sup> STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**ACTION:** Ms. Schlotterbeck moved to adopt the minutes of the 581<sup>st</sup> Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 14 January 2011. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

## **THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 JANUARY 2011**

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

### **CONSENT AGENDA**

Mr. Farnham presented the applications on the Consent Agenda, 1700 Mount Vernon Street and 1801-27 Green Street, to the Commission. Mr. Mattioni recused from the consideration of the Consent Agenda because his law firm does business with Michael Loonstyn, the applicant for 1700 Mount Vernon Street.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 1700 Mount Vernon Street and 1801-27 Green Street. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **AGENDA**

#### **230-32 S. HUTCHINSON STREET**

Owner: David Watt

Applicant: Adam Montalbano, architect

History: c. 1830; carriage house, c. 1885

Designation: individually designated, 1/1/1961

Project: Legalize inappropriate windows

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to the June 2010 Historical Commission approval and Standards 2, 6, and 9.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to legalize inappropriate windows installed in three main facades of this property. This property includes a total of three buildings, two 1830s row houses and a late nineteenth-century carriage house. All three properties have been consolidated into a single residence and tax parcel. The properties are located on a corner lot making them highly visible from the public right-of-way. The property was purchased in December 2009 by the present owner, who undertook a complete rehabilitation of the property, both interior and exterior. The Historical Commission reviewed and approved the rehabilitation project in June 2010. The staff subsequently placed the approval stamp on the building permitting set of drawings reflecting the Commission's approval. Those drawings included the correct windows in all elevations. The staff also reviewed and approved shop drawings showing the correct windows. However, six-over-six windows instead of the approved and correct windows three-over-six windows were installed in the third-floor openings. The architect for the project has conceded that the wrong windows were ordered and installed.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Danta presented the application to the Commission. Property owner David Watt and architect Adam Montalbano represented the application.

**MOTION:** Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to the June 2010 Historical Commission approval and Standards 2, 6, and 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion.

Mr. Sherman asked the applicants to explain why they installed windows other than those approved by the Commission. Mr. Montalbano stated that the original window specification correctly showed the three-over-six windows. However, the contractor who specified that order was replaced and the new contractor revised the window order with Tague Lumber, wrongly specifying six-over-six windows. The property owner approved the window order without realizing that the wrong windows had been specified. The wrong windows were installed. Mr. Sherman asked if the window provider, Tague Lumber, had made the mistake. Mr. Watt replied that it was unclear who had made the initial mistake that led to the ordering of the incorrect windows. He stated that there was a miscommunication. Mr. Sherman asked if the sash alone could be replaced, or the entire window with frame would require replacement. Mr. Watt stated that the Tague salesman thought that the frames would need to be replaced with the sash, owing to the differences in sash size.

Ms. Merriman stated that, to her, the identity of the person who caused the wrong windows to be installed is unimportant. She stated that, regardless whether it was the owner, a contractor, or the window supplier, the owner has the responsibility to ensure that the project is completed as approved by the Commission.

Mr. Watt claimed that he explored his neighborhood and was unable to find any other three-over-six windows. He also claimed that he looked at books of historic photographs of buildings in Philadelphia and was unable to find any three-over-six windows. He then introduced a copy of an 1858 insurance survey for his property that he discovered at the Historical Society of Pennsylvania. He asserted that the survey specified six-over-six windows for his house. He contended that the three-over-six windows seen in the Commission's photograph were later additions and did not reflect the historic condition. He added that the house had suffered a significant fire and the windows may have been changed at that time. Ms. Merriman noted that the Architectural Committee had definitively concluded that the insurance survey was in error. She asked Mr. Danta to comment on it. Mr. Danta stated that the insurance survey clearly contains an error. It describes the third-floor windows in question as 12-light windows but also states that the individual panes of glass are 8 inches by 10 inches. He stated that 12 panes of that size could not possibly fit in a window opening of the size of the third-floor openings. He stated that the same survey also describes the second-floor windows as 12-light windows with individual panes of glass that are 8 inches by 10 inches. However, the second-floor window openings are much larger and could accommodate 12 panes, each 8 inches by 10 inches. He concluded that the survey is in error. Mr. Danta also pointed out that the building in question is one of a row of identical buildings. The Commission's photograph shows three-over-six windows at the third floors of all buildings. An old insurance survey for one of the buildings in the row describes the third-floor windows as three-over-six. Mr. Danta explained that three-over-six windows are very common in the smaller upper windows of workers' houses of this era. He stated that the configuration allowed the window panes to maintain the same proportions as the larger windows below. If a six-over-six is installed in the small window opening, the panes become very small and out of proportion with the other window panes. Mr. Danta claimed that the three-over-six window configuration is very common on the little streets in the Washington Square West neighborhood, where these buildings are located. Mr. Baron agreed. He stated

that he lives in a rowhouse of the same vintage; the row originally had three-over-six windows. Mr. Watt disagreed with Messrs. Danta and Baron. He stated that he surveyed every three-story rowhouse within an eight-block area of his house and did not find one three-over-six window. Mr. Thomas stated that he has been giving walking tours of the neighborhood for 30 years. He stated that three-over-six windows do exist in the area, but are somewhat unusual. He stated that he could provide photographs of one dozen examples from the area. He stated that the pane proportions in the six-over-six windows that were installed are inappropriate. He noted that they have a horizontal orientation, but should have a vertical orientation. He stated that the three-over-six configuration would give the panes the desired vertical configuration. Mr. Thomas observed that Mr. Watt, as the building owner, has a responsibility to ensure that his contractors perform their work in compliance with the approved plans. In this case, the contractors did not perform their work to comply with the approved plans. The owner should correct their mistakes. Mr. Thomas added that he thought that the frames could be reused with new sash, perhaps with an adjustment to the sash weights. Mr. Baron remarked that the Jeldwen windows typically have jamb liners, but no sash weights.

**ACTION:** The Commission voted unanimously to approve the motion proffered by Mses. Merriman and Leonard to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to the June 2010 Historical Commission approval and Standards 2, 6, and 9.

#### **655-59 N. 16<sup>TH</sup> STREET**

Owner: Calvary Baptist Church

Applicant: Michael Loonstyn

History: c.1855 as Hedding Methodist Episcopal Church; c.1900, Union AME Church; alterations, 1902, Watson & Huckel; alterations, 1906, C. Davis; c. 1962 Calvary Baptist Church

Designation: Individually Designated May 4, 1972, Significant to Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Proposal: Convert church to residential use

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the windows and balconies, but approval of all other aspects of the application, provided the gable cornice is reconstructed, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes converting a church building to residential use. Casement windows would be installed in place of the extant non-historic windows. Outdoor space would be provided for most units. On the south side of the roof, some of the roof structure would be cut away and two decks created. The decks would not be visible from any right of way. Decks and fenced patio areas would be created along the front and north or side facades. Two doors would be cut into the stuccoed north facade to provide access to patios. At the upper floors of the north façade, shallow balconies would be installed. Also at the north façade, a non-historic chimney would be demolished and the stucco would be painted.

Most, but not all, of these changes satisfy the Standards. The installation of the casement windows in all facades and balconies in the north façade do not meet the Standards. The window openings on the north wall should not be enlarged beyond their historic sizes to install balconies. Also, the cornice along the pitched sections of the front gable should be reconstructed to complete the gable and to protect the exposed brick façade, which shows evidence of water infiltration.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Mattioni recused from the consideration of the application because his law firm does business with Michael Loonstyn, the applicant. Mr. Baron presented the application to Commission. Developer Michael Loonstyn and architect John Bushnell represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the applicants have revised their application since the Architectural Committee meeting to comply with some of the Committee's suggestions. The front windows have been changed to double-hungs with hoppers. The missing cornice framing the pediment has been added. Mr. Baron explained that the design of the spandrel panels had been revised based on a historic photograph. Also, the HVAC equipment as well as a screen to block views of the equipment have now been included on the architectural drawings. Finally, the applicant has retained the casement windows and balconies on the side façade, even though the Committee recommended their deletions. Mr. Sherman noted that something will be built on the vacant lot to the north, blocking views of the balconies. Ms. Merriman asked how far the balconies project from the building. Mr. Bushnell stated that they would project 1'-2". There would be six Juliet balconies, all on the north side. Mr. Thomas stated that the balconies are very small, fit the windows, and would be easily reversible. He also noted that the roof decks would not be visible from the street. He contended that these minor changes were acceptable for the building, which is taking on a new use. He added that the restoration of the pediment was a positive step.

Mr. Baron explained that it appears that all stained glass has been removed, but that he would like to have any surviving stained glass preserved. Mr. Loonstyn stated that he would be happy to have Mr. Baron verify that no stained glass survives.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to approve the revised plans presented to the Commission at its meeting of 11 February 2011, provided all extant stained glass windows are retained, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **1700 MT. VERNON STREET**

Owner: Spring Garden CDC

Applicant: Michael Loonstyn

History: c. 1859

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

Proposal: Rehabilitate rowhouse

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architecture Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6, 9, and 10.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes rehabilitating a corner rowhouse, which is currently a shell. Two-over-two windows would be installed, the bays would be restored with wood panels, and the storefronts would be reopened and restored. The cast-iron column at the corner would be re-exposed, the cinderblock infill would be removed, and the tin-shingle storefront pent roofs would be restored. A cinderblock wall in the rear yard would be removed and a fenced parking place installed. Decks would be constructed on the rear bay and on the roof of the rear ell. The roof deck and stair house would be significantly set back from the streets, making them inconspicuous from the public right-of-way.

**ACTION: SEE CONSENT AGENDA**

**1731 SPRING GARDEN STREET**

Owner: 1731 Spring Garden Association

Applicant: William Proud, mason

History: c. 1886

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

Proposal: Paint brownstone façade

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposed color scheme, but approval of the painting the façade in colors that replicate the inherent colors of the original masonry façade materials, with the staff to review details including color samples, pursuant to Standard 6.

**OVERVIEW:** This brownstone faced mansion is currently painted grey. A mason will be repairing the façade. The owner wishes to paint the façade a light grey and the brownstone window surrounds a darker grey. The Commission has usually required applicants to either remove paint from painted masonry façades or, if the paint cannot be feasibly removed, paint those facades the color of the underlying masonry materials. In this case, the facade should be painted its natural underlying brown, not grey, colors.

**DISCUSSION:** Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Mason Gary Martin and owner Ed Chacker represented the project.

**MOTION:** Mr. Schaaf moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the proposed color scheme, but approve the painting of the façade in colors that replicate the inherent colors of the original masonry façade materials, with the staff to review details including color samples, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion.

Mr. Sherman asked Mr. Chacker if he “was in agreement with the color scheme that has been presented here today.” Mr. Chacker responded that he was in agreement with it.

**ACTION:** The Commission voted unanimously to approve the motion proffered by Mr. Schaaf and Ms. Leonard to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the proposed color scheme, but approve the painting of the façade in colors that replicate the inherent colors of the original masonry façade materials, with the staff to review details including color samples, pursuant to Standard 6.

Mr. Chacker thanked the Commission for approving his color scheme. Mr. Baron informed Mr. Chacker that the Commission had just denied, not approved, Mr. Chacker’s proposed color scheme. Mr. Chacker stated that he had been confused when he stated that he agreed with the motion. He stated that he does not agree with the motion. He asked the Commission to hear his side of the case and then reconsider the action.

Mr. Chacker stated that his business has been on Spring Garden Street since the 1970s. It was at 1910 Spring Garden for years. He stated that he always maintained that building as required by the Commission including repinning the marble façade to the building. He stated that he has invested \$300,000 in his current building. He explained that the building is currently painted blue. A mason will restore the front façade. Mr. Chacker explained that he would like to paint the façade grey after the masonry is restored. He asserted that there are very few historically

significant buildings in the area. Many of the buildings are ugly, he asserted. He stated that he does not want to paint the building brown, like the brownstone, because he does not want “a blob of brown.” Mr. Chacker stated that the building next to his is very nice. It has marble beltcourses. His is not as nice.

Mr. Martin, the mason, stated that the exterior of Mr. Chacker’s building has been coated with one inch of plaster. Also, the first-floor façade has been refaced with an unknown material.

Mr. Baron stated that the Committee’s recommendation is consistent with the Commission’s longstanding practice. Mr. Baron added that the recommendation does not require brown, but requires the colors of the underlying materials.

**ACTION:** Ms. Merriman moved to reconsider the application. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 9 to 3. Mses. Jones and Leonard and Mr. Quinn dissented.

Mr. Thomas asked that the minute reflect the fact that the Commission allowed for the reconsideration because the applicant had not understood the original motion until after the Commission acted. Mr. Thomas stated that the first floor front façade has been substantially altered. He added that he agrees with the recommendation of the Committee, which meets the Standards. Mr. Baron stated that he thinks that the first floor is altered, but the original material survives under the newer material. Mr. Chacker stated that the original material is largely gone at the first floor, but the window openings are original; the interior shutters survive on the windows.

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the proposed color scheme, but approve the painting of the façade in colors that replicate the inherent colors of the original masonry façade materials, with the staff to review details including color samples, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 11 to 1. Ms. Merriman dissented.

### **1801-27 GREEN STREET**

Owner: Brianna Dunn, School District of Philadelphia

Applicant: Lisa Murch, Mural Arts Program

History: 1956-62

Designation: Non-contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, 10/11/2000

Project: Legalize mural

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

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to legalize a mural installed around an entrance on the east elevation of the Laura Wheeler Waring Public School. The mural is composed of paint and mosaic tiles and is attached to the brick façade, which was ground down to create a smooth surface. The building is classified as non-contributing in the district.

**ACTION: SEE CONSENT AGENDA**

### **1201 SPRUCE STREET**

Owner: Odd Fellows of America

Applicant: Ryan Lohbauer

History: 1906, Watson & Huckel, architects

Designation: Individually designated, 12/12/2008

Project: Replace storefront windows and doors

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the design depicted on the drawing labeled A-401, but approval of the design depicted on the drawing labeled SK-3 and dated 25 January 2011, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes the replacement of storefront windows and doors. The existing windows are non-historic, four-light, metal, fixed windows and wood, four-light casements with transoms. The applicant proposes to replace the existing storefront windows with four single-light, aluminum casements. The existing doors are non-historic. They are a three-part, metal system with transoms and sidelights and a three-part, wood system with transoms and sidelights. The applicant proposes to replace the doors with aluminum doors to fit within existing openings.

The Architectural Committee reviewed a similar application in December 2010. That application proposed four single-light, wood casements with three-light transoms in line with the three-part windows on the upper levels. The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The applicant withdrew the application before the Commission meeting. The applicant has revised the proposal and responded to suggestions offered by the Committee in December.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. No one represented the application.

Ms. Sell stated that the applicant supports the Architectural Committee's recommendation.

**ACTION:** Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the design depicted on the drawing labeled A-401, but approve the design depicted on the drawing labeled SK-3 and dated 25 January 2011, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

### **340-50 S. 2<sup>ND</sup> STREET**

Owner: Wells Fargo Bank, NA

Applicant: Gary Brent

History: c. 1868, upper three stories later removed

Designation: contributing to the Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: Install new signs

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the parapet signs, labeled NE01 and NE02 on the drawings, approval of the entrance sign, labeled E01 on the drawings, provided the existing sign is internally illuminated, and approval of all other proposed signs, pursuant to Standard 9.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes to install new signs on this bank building. The bank building is located at the corner of 2<sup>nd</sup> and Pine Streets, directly across from the 2<sup>nd</sup> Street



Market Head House. The application proposes to replace all existing Wachovia Bank signs with signs for Wells Fargo Bank, which acquired Wachovia. It also proposes to add new signs.

Two signs would be installed on the front façade of the building; only one would be a replacement of an existing sign. Currently, there is a Wachovia Bank sign over the main entrance; it is metal and non-illuminated. The proposed replacement would have a plastic face and be internally illuminated. A second sign would be located on the parapet over the main entrance of the front façade. This sign would be made out of individual metal letters. It would not be illuminated.

A sign with individual metal letters would be located on the north façade parapet; it would resemble the sign proposed for the front parapet. A second, internally-illuminated sign would be located on the rear façade of the property over a rear entrance from the parking lot. This sign would not be visible from the public-right-of-way.

The application proposes various small signs that pose no adverse effect to the historic character of the property or the district.

Two banners sign would be installed in the interior of the banking room and would be visible through the windows facing Pine Street. The Commission does not have jurisdiction over signs installed in an interior, unless that interior has been designated as historic.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Coté presented the application to the Commission. Heather McLeod, Jeff Dickinson, and Gary Brent represented the application.

Ms. McLeod distributed revised application materials to the Commission. She stated that the revised sign over the entrance is not illuminated, as recommended by the Committee. She pointed out signs behind the windows, in the interior of the building. Mr. Dickinson stated that the interior signs would be located about 18 inches behind the glass. Mr. Sherman informed the applicants that the Commission does not have jurisdiction over signs hung in the interior, behind the glass. Ms. McLeod noted that the front and rear parapet signs have been eliminated and a non-illuminated sign has been added to the east parapet. Ms. Coté stated that the sign would be painted on the parapet; the parapet is already painted. Mr. Danta showed a photograph of the building before the second floor was removed. Ms. McLeod stated that they are now proposing a non-illuminated logo sign at the parking lot.

Lorna Katz-Lawson of the Society Hill Civic Association objected to the internally illuminated signage. She also objected to the towing signs in the parking lot. Mr. Farnham asked Ms. Katz-Lawson to direct her comments to the Commission and not question the applicant directly.

Mr. Farnham asked the applicant to confirm that the sign over the door on Pine Street would not be illuminated. Ms. McLeod stated that it would not. Mr. Farnham asked her to confirm that illuminated signs inside the bank would not be attached to the windows, but would hang behind them. Ms. McLeod stated that they would hang behind the windows. Mr. Farnham informed Ms. Katz-Lawson that the Commission has no jurisdiction over the interior signs. Ms. Katz-Lawson stated that she forced the Superfresh Supermarket to remove a large sign and she would force this bank to abandon its plan to install the interior signs in the windows. Mr. Farnham summarized the application: the changes to the ATM, the non-illuminated sign over the door, the non-illuminated sign on the east-facing parapet, the non-illuminated logo sign on a non-historic façade facing the parking lot, and the various accessory signage.

**ACTION:** Ms. Merriman moved to approve the revised sign application presented to the Historical Commission at its meeting of 11 February 2011. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 11 to 1. Ms. Jaffe dissented.

#### **604-36 S. WASHINGTON SQUARE**

Owner: Hopkinson House Owner's Association

Applicant: Theresa Pearce Shepherd, P.E.

History: 1961, Oscar Stonorov, architect

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

Proposal: Install HVAC equipment

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION:** The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

**OVERVIEW:** This application proposes the replacement of the building's central hot water heating system with individually controlled electric heating and cooling systems in every condominium unit. The building was constructed with black-colored vent panels under some windows and plain black panels under others. The new electric units, which will be black in color, would be inserted into some, but not all of the panels. They would project out 7 to 8 inches beyond the faces of the panels. The units could be moved farther into the interior, thereby projecting less, but they would potentially disrupt interior spaces.

**DISCUSSION:** Ms. Coté explained that the applicant has requested a two-month continuance to the April 2011 meeting. Mr. Farnham added that the continuance would allow the applicant to prepare a mock-up of the HVAC equipment for presentation to the Commission.

**ACTION:** Ms. Merriman moved to continue the application to the meeting of April 2011. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

**ACTION:** Ms. Merriman moved to adjourn at 10:24 a.m. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

#### **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 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.