

**THE MINUTES OF THE 602ND STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**FRIDAY, 12 OCTOBER 2012
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Richardson Dilworth III, Ph.D.
Anuj Gupta
Dominique Hawkins
JoAnn Jones, Office of Housing & Community Development
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Joseph Palantino, Department of Public Property
Dan Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas
Betty Turner

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

ALSO PRESENT

Tim Shaaban, Urban Space Development
Clifton Hayman, Trinity Lutheran Church
Pastor Diana Vidlak, Trinity Lutheran Church
Michael McCullin, Fourth River Signworks
Rich Vogel
Catherine K. Franklin, Penn-Knox Neighborhood Association
Lee Riccetti, Penn Design
Erica Maust, Penn Design
Jon Vimr, Penn Design
Soeun Park, Penn Design
Xiaojuan Zhu, Penn Design
Caroline Arez, Penn Design
David Hollenberg, Penn Design

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Commissioners Dilworth, Gupta, Hawkins, Jones, Leonard, Merriman, Palantino, Quinn, Schaaf, Thomas, and Turner joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 601ST STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 601st Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 14 September 2012. Ms. Jones seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 SEPTEMBER 2012

Dominique Hawkins, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Farnham introduced the consent agenda and explained that it included an application for 336 S. 02nd Street. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments. Mr. Sherman asked if the audience had comments on the Consent Agenda. No one offered comments.

ACTION: Ms. Jones moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee for 336 S. 02nd Street. Ms. Turner seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

AGENDA

ADDRESS: 233 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Restore exterior, construct fifth-story addition with roof decks

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 233 Chestnut Street Development, LLC

Applicant: Tim Shaaban, Urban Space Development Inc

History: 1870

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the restoration of the storefront and windows is accurate, Jahn or a similar product is used for the brownstone repair, and a mock up of the deck railings , addition, and elevator machine room indicates that they will not be visible from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, and denial of the alteration to the doorways, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the front façade, which includes, washing the brick, repairing the brownstone elements, replacing windows, and reestablishing the historic storefront configuration. The restoration is based on a period photograph from 1930. A more accurate restoration could be done if this photograph is used in conjunction with the 1857 Baxter Panoramic view of the street. The staff suggests that Jahn or a similar product would be a more appropriate repair method for the brownstone rather than paint.

This application also proposes to construct a fifth-story addition with a roof deck. The addition would be set back about 11 feet. However, a roof deck is proposed for front of the addition. The addition would have brick cladding and windows to match the restored façade.

DISCUSSION: The staff explained that it granted a one-month continuance of the application, but the applicant is requesting a second month, to December 2012, which only the Commission is authorized to grant.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to continue the application to the December 2012 meeting of the Historical Commission. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 336 S 02ND ST

Project: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Harvey Schwartz

Applicant: Tuval Shlomo, Star Painting and Sons LLC

History: 1973; G.E. Smith, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that a mock up indicates that the railing, enclosures, and pergola are minimally visible from the public right-of-way, and provided that the chimney is not extended, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct roof deck and trellis on the rear portion of the house. The proposal includes building up the parapet with a planter box on top. Enclosure for the HVAC units is also proposed.

ACTION: See Consent Agenda

ADDRESS: 668 N 15TH ST

Project: Legalize roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: John Makridakis

Applicant: Victor Mejia, The Azteco

History: 1859

Individual Designation: None

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

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the construction of a roof deck on the rear ell. The deck is accessed from a window that was cut down to a door. The railing for the deck is a six-foot stockade fence. The staff suggests that a metal rail with vertical pickets would be more appropriate.

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

Ms. Merriman questioned why the Architectural Committee's recommendation differed from that of the staff. Ms. Hawkins answered that the Committee could not have a conversation with the applicant because no one represented the application at the Committee meeting. She stated that the Committee found the stockade fencing inappropriate for a deck. Mr. Farnham stated that the applicant was experiencing health issues and could not attend the meetings. He explained that the staff believed that the deck is on the right location on the roof and that, with a metal railing, the deck would be visible but inconspicuous. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee would have probably agreed with the staff had the applicant attended the meeting.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to approve the application, provided the solid wood railing is replaced with a metal railing that is at least 50% transparent, with the staff to review details. Mr. Dilworth seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 3452 MIDVALE AVE

Project: Legalize replacement of retaining wall

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Rosemary R. Goldman

Applicant: Rosemary R. Goldman

History: 1930

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Tudor East Falls Historic District, Contributing, 10/9/2009

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the demolition of the original Wissahickon schist garden wall and construction of a brown stone retaining wall. The wall runs along the front of the property at the sidewalk. This work was done without the approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of Licenses and Inspections. A building permit is required for this type of retaining wall whether the property is designated as historic or not.

One of the character-defining features of the Tudor East Falls Historic District, described in the inventory, are the “front gardens afforded by setbacks, continuity of these gardens, a lack of front property-line fences, [and] extensive use of fieldstone garden walls ...”

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Owner Rosemary Goldman represented the application.

Ms. Goldman explained that her husband could not attend as he is recovering from injuries. She explained that the garden walls and houses along the 3400 block of Midvale Avenue do not match. She showed photographs of houses on the southeast side of the street with garden walls of varying heights and constructed of varying stone. She reported that the wall was in disrepair and she had it rebuilt using the original stone in June 2011. She claimed that the stone was deteriorated by August 2012 and stated that she rebuilt the wall with sandstone at that time. She explained that she was advised that the sandstone was the same as the original stone. She stated that mortar was installed into the joints behind the new wall to maintain a dry wall appearance and drainage pipes were installed to prevent water deterioration. She added that the original wall did not have a footing, separation fabric, or drainage. She stated that an inspector from the Department of Licenses & Inspections told the landscaper that a permit was required for construction of a wall over two feet in height.

Mr. Sherman asked if the inspector stopped the work before its completion. Ms. Goldman stated that the work was nearly complete when he arrived. Mr. Baron added that he went out to the site at the beginning of construction and spoke with the landscaper to inform him of the Commission’s jurisdiction. He informed the worker that the material did not match the original schist. He claimed the worker stated that his company has access to schist, but that it was the client’s preference to install sandstone.

Mr. Dilworth asked how the violation was reported to the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Mr. Quinn explained that an inspector may have witnessed the work in progress or a report may have been made to the Department of Licenses & Inspections.

Ms. Merriman stated that she understands that there was a misunderstanding about the procedures in a new historic district, but explained that there are stark differences between the original wall and the new wall. She opined that the only remedy is replacement with the appropriate schist material. Ms. Goldman argued that there are striking differences between the building facades and garden walls in the historic district. Ms. Merriman explained that the standards call for restoration and, when walls need to be replaced, they must be replaced with the historic material. Ms. Goldman stated that the rationale cited in the minutes from the Architectural Committee's meeting was that the new wall does not match her neighbors' walls. She argued that none of the walls, doors, or windows match one another. Mr. Sherman clarified that any alterations that are made to the exteriors of historically designated properties prior to designation are grand-fathered in with the designation. He explained that, if a property owner, for example, replaced windows with a non-historic material before the designation, they may legally remain until it is time for replacement. He continued that, when the windows are replaced, the property owner is required to obtain the Commission's approval. The Commission requires the replacement of windows with new windows that match the historic material and appropriate architectural style. He explained that Ms. Goldman's previous wall appeared to be the original schist retaining wall. He explained that, when the wall is to be replaced, that it must be replaced with the historic material, where possible. He recalled that Mr. Baron had a conversation with the landscaper, who noted that he has access to the correct material; therefore, it is possible to replace the wall with the historic material. Ms. Goldman stated that she selected a stone that would not deteriorate and would complement the house. She stated that the original schist had deteriorated. Ms. Hawkins responded that schist does not deteriorate. She acknowledged that there may have been reconstruction problems with the wall in June 2011, resulting in a need to replace it in 2012. She opined that the problem may have been with the reconstruction and lack of installation of appropriate drainage, but the stone itself should have been intact. Ms. Goldman stated that others in the neighborhood have added other stone types to their walls that differ from the original in size and color.

Mr. Thomas asked Ms. Goldman if the inspector referred to the footing of the original wall or the new wall. Ms. Goldman responded that it was the new wall. Mr. Thomas asked what the problem was with the original footing. Ms. Goldman explained that there was no footing under the original wall. Mr. Thomas explained that a lack of footing may have been the problem. He explained that there are thousands of schist walls in the area that are well over 100 years old that require routine pointing, but the stone is fine. He explained that a wall constructed without a footing will begin to heave and fall over time. Ms. Goldman argued that the way the wall is currently constructed would not be subject to that kind of deterioration.

Ms. Sell explained that the question before the Commission is whether this proposal meets Standard 6, which states, "Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of distinctive features, 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." She concluded that the original material is available and therefore should be considered possible. Ms. Goldman explained that when the wall was reconstructed in 2011, the stone was in a deteriorated condition. Mr. Sherman clarified that the stone had not deteriorated, but rather the wall had failed. He added that the stone necessary to appropriately replace the wall was available. He stated that the Commission must base its decision on Standard 6.

Ms. Goldman stated that many of the walls on this street are in disrepair. Mr. Thomas explained that they may all need footings and that they are likely coming to the point where they will need to be repaired. He added that it is likely that the first mason who rebuilt the wall in June 2011 did not get a permit because construction of a heavy stone retaining wall without a footing on bare earth does not meet any building code. He explained that, had an inspector come by at that time, he or she would have stopped the process and required a footing. He explained that, in the past, things were done that no longer meet code. He described, for example, that carriage doors originally had wooden lintels, over time the lintels fail, and they need to be replaced with steel. He asserted that a permit is required for any retaining wall that is higher than two feet regardless of its historic designation. He explained that a permit is required to protect the homeowner to ensure the work is being done correctly and to code. Ms. Goldman argued that the plans reviewer at the Department of Licenses & Inspections stated that she did not understand why a permit would be required for an existing wall. Ms. Goldman added that she had not received a copy of the Secretary of the Interior's Standards when the district was designated. Mr. Thomas pointed out that homeowners are not furnished with a copy of the building code when purchasing a home and that the burden of due diligence is on the homeowner.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9. Mr. Quinn seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 2136-42 E DAUPHIN ST

Project: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Federal Credit Union

Applicant: Michael McCullin, Fourth River Signworks

History: 1896; 26th District Police Station; John T. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: 7/5/1984

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install signage on the east elevation of this building. Built in 1896 as the 26th District Police Station, this historic building is undergoing an extensive rehabilitation for reuse as a bank on the first floor and residential apartments on the second and third floors.

The proposed signage includes 34 metal letters to be installed with studs and adhesive on the brick elevation above the second-story windows. No attachment information has been provided regarding size, number, or placement of the studs. An internally-illuminated aluminum and acrylic box sign with push-through letters on urethane brackets and steel backer is proposed on the first-story adjacent to the carriage entrance. The total height of the sign measures less than seven feet. The first-story façade is articulated with a patterned banding of dentiled bricks that horizontally wrap the elevation. The vertical sign would be installed over this feature. No attachment information has been provided.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Commission. Signage contractor Michael McCullin represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked how power will be delivered to the internally-illuminated sign. She also asked the applicant if he had supplied staff with any additional information. Mr. McCullin explained that he is not installing the electric, but that the sign will be attached with studs between the mortar joints. He explained the pin letters would be attached with three one-eighth-inch studs into brick faces and mortar joints. He explained that they have reduced the size of the internally-illuminated sign per the staff recommendation.

Ms. Merriman asked Ms. Sell what other areas were suggested for signage. Ms. Sell explained that she had several conversations with Mr. McCullin about sign locations. She stated that, because the main entrance will be the east elevation, the signage could be closer to the doors or attached to the glazing of the new storefront that will be installed within the carriage entrance. She explained that the dentiled banding wraps up to the carriage entrance and that she suggested installing signage that comes away from the wall to allow the banding to be read beneath the sign. She added that the entrance with large transom that could also be utilized for signage. She contended that a projecting sign is a feature that is needed at this location as it is not on the main thoroughfare. She explained that it is not on Frankford Avenue, but rather one block over on Trenton Avenue, a lightly travelled street. She suggested that the proposed flat installation against the banding and the seven-foot in height are not appropriate. She explained that the pin letters, while spatially an option, would cause too many penetrations into the faces of the brick. Mr. McCullin argued that one would not be able to see the holes or penetrations from ground level if the letters are ever removed. He contended that the repair would be simple. Ms. Sell explained that the staff is concerned about conservation of the brick as opposed to visibility of the holes. She added that the staff suggested the pin letters be attached to a backer board panel that could be attached with many fewer holes or penetrations into the façade, but the client was not in favor of this option. Ms. Hawkins suggested that banks often change hands and signage may need to be altered over time. Mr. Thomas explained that the building was not built as a commercial structure and therefore does not lend itself to signage. He suggested a pole-mounted sign installed into the sidewalk might be an appropriate option. Mr. McCullin stated that he believes pole-mounted signs must be at least 15 feet from the building and the street and there is not enough room on this sidewalk. Mr. Thomas explained that, while the Commission does its best at working with other departments, there are times when the best option would require a variance.

The Commission members suggested that, owing to various design questions and concerns, a revised application should be submitted for a new round of review.

Mr. McCullin withdrew the application.

ADDRESS: 5300 GERMANTOWN AVE

Project: Replace fence and legalize replacement of fence

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Trinity Lutheran Church

Applicant: Clifton Hayman, Trinity Lutheran Church

History: 1856; Trinity Lutheran Church (1856) and Church (Sower) House (1723, 1755); Jacob & George A. Binder, designers of church

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

District Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: The Trinity Lutheran Church complex in Germantown includes an eighteenth-century church house on Germantown Avenue, a mid nineteenth-century Italianate church set back from Germantown Avenue, and a graveyard that runs along Queen Lane.

A long fence with several gates runs along Queen Lane from the rear of the church house to the rear property line. A section of the old fence was recently removed and replaced with a new black metal fence without the Historical Commission's approval. A second section awaits removal and replacement. The congregation would like to replace all of the fencing on Queen Lane. It contends that the old fence had been damaged by a falling tree and was in general disrepair. The application proposes legalization of the replaced section and approval of the replacement of the second section.

The new fence is the same height as the old fence, but does not match it in design. The old fence consists of decorative cast iron posts at the gates and metal hairpin fencing and gates. The decorative posts and hairpin gates will be retained. The removed section of hairpin fence has not yet been disposed of and is currently stored at the site.

The staff will undertake research to identify the design of the original fence. If the hairpin fence proves to be the original fence, it should be repaired and reinstalled.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Clifton Hayman, Diana Vidlak, and Nathan Raleigh of the church represented the application.

Mr. Hayman reported that he had obtained an estimate at the suggestion of the Committee to repair the damaged historic fence. He distributed copies of the estimate and additional photographs. He said that the new fence looks like the original fence on Germantown Avenue and that they wish to continue installing that fence.

Ms. Hawkins explained that the fence that they wish to remove appears to date to the nineteenth century and looks to be repairable. Mr. Hayman explained that the congregation is small, with only 40 members. He said that the estimated cost for repair of 240' and fabrication of 40' of new fence is \$11,550. The cost of the new fence was \$12,000, half of which they have already paid to the contractor.

Mr. Sherman inquired as to the visibility of the fence. He was told that all of it is visible from the public right-of-way.

The Commission members expressed confusion about which parts of the fence would be repaired under the submitted estimate.

Richard Vogel, a neighbor on Queen Lane, explained that he has a similar hairpin fence on his property, which he has repaired. He said that the church's estimate for this work seems high and that the church should seek additional bids. He said that the new aluminum fence is an off-the-shelf type that is inappropriate for this historic location.

Catherine Franklin, who said she own property adjacent to the church, stated that she has been approached by many neighbors concerned with the loss of the historic fence. She said that the fence surrounds the historic cemetery. She also expressed concern about the condition of the church steeple. She said that many people in the area have repaired these fences and that they are considered valuable historic assets.

Mr. Gupta advised the applicants to submit a hardship application. He said that many religious properties face this sort of problem in the city. Mr. Baron suggested that he could assist the applicants with filing a hardship application. He thought it would be wise to meet with the contractor who provided the estimate to see if there is piece of the existing fence that could be restored at a reasonable price. The hardship application may yield a compromise solution.

Mr. Farnham clarified which parts of the fence have been replaced, which are missing, and which are still in place. He also explained that the fence along Germantown Avenue will not be replaced and that it was installed as part of the plans of the well known architect Mantel Fielding in the early twentieth century.

Mr. Haymen asked where he might get financial assistance for his project. He explained that the Preservation Alliance had not helped him. Mr. Baron explained that, in addition to the listing on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places, the property is part of the Colonial Germantown National Register Historic District. He offered to speak to the various preservation groups regarding what assistance they might offer.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to deny the application, but to postpone any enforcement of the violation for one year. Mr. Gupta seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADDRESS: 216 S JESSUP ST

Project: Install door and paint masonry

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Barbara Arvanitis

Applicant: Barbara Arvanitis

History: 1845

Individual Designation: 2/28/1961

District Designation: None

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

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of both the door and paint applications, pursuant to Standard 6.

OVERVIEW: This submission is presented as two applications. One application proposes to remove a non-historic door and replace it with a second non-historic door, which has no historical basis. The other application proposes to paint the brick front façade of the building a

brown color that has no relation to the brick-red color inherent to the historic material. The building is currently painted an off white color. For applications proposing to paint previously-painted brick facades, the Commission has routinely required either the removal of the paint and exposure of the brick or, if removal is not feasible, the painting of the façade to replicate the underlying red color of the brick.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Commission. Property owner Barbara Arvanitis represented the application.

Mr. Baron displayed photographs of several buildings painted brick red. He said that the issue with painting a color other than the underlying material color is that there becomes no rational, objective basis for selecting a color. It becomes a subjective matter of taste.

Ms. Arvanitis spoke about the proposed door and said that she would like to amend her proposal for the door and now propose a six-panel door similar to others on her block. She would also like to propose a three-panel shutter to match that door. Ms. Hawkins asked Mr. Baron about the appropriateness of the newly proposed door. Mr. Baron said that, although he thinks that the previously recommended four- or five-panel doors would be more appropriate, because we have no record of the original door, an argument could be made for the newly proposed six-panel door. Ms. Hawkins suggested approving the six-panel door and three-panel shutters.

On the issue of the paint, Ms. Arvanitis said that she thinks that brick red is too dark and unattractive. She said that the current color of her house is whitish grey and the neighbors' houses are yellowish cream. Mr. Sherman raised the Committee's concern about the potential for damage resulting from adding another layer of paint. Ms. Arvanitis said she does not want to remove the paint because the removal might damage the brick. She also stated that the cost of repainting the wall might be high. She noted that Fraunces Tavern in New York has imported Dutch yellow bricks. She thought that home owners might have seen yellow brick buildings and painted in that same palette. Mr. Dilworth asked about the availability of multiple colors of brick and whether people in the nineteenth century painted their brick. He thought that this would create an argument to allow for the painting this façade. Mr. Baron explained that many buildings had a red wash that hid the white of the mortar joints, but that painting brick was typically done later to hide mismatched brick infill or repairs. Mr. Farnham vehemently rejected Mr. Dilworth's contention and explained that the Commission bases its decisions on the actual historical features of a building, not the range of options that might have existed for original property owners. Mr. Thomas read from the Standards, which state that, when a feature is replaced, it should match the color of the original feature. Ms. Arvanitis said that the Commission did not regulate color in 1968. Mr. Farnham disagreed with her claim and explained that, regardless of its veracity, it was irrelevant because the Commission is working under an ordinance, regulations, and standards that have been adopted since that time.

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the door and paint applications, pursuant to Standard 6. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed by a vote of 8 to 4. Ms. Merriman and Messrs. Palantino, Schaaf, and Sherman dissented.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Ms. Hawkins moved to adjourn at 11:10 a.m. Mr. Thomas 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 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.

Roofs Guideline: Recommended: Designing additions to roofs such as residential, office, or storage spaces; elevator housing; decks and terraces; or dormers or skylights when required by the new use so that they are inconspicuous from the public right-of-way and do not damage or obscure character-defining features.