

**THE MINUTES OF THE 574TH STATED MEETING OF THE
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION**

**11 JUNE 2010
ROOM 18-029, 1515 ARCH STREET
SAM SHERMAN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Sam Sherman, Chair
Leslie Benoliel
Susan O. W. Jaffe
Jo Ann Jones, Office of Housing & Community Development
Rosalie Leonard, Office of City Council President
John Mattioni, Esq.
Sara Merriman, Commerce Department
Joseph Palantino, Department of Public Property
Daniel Quinn, Department of Licenses & Inspections
David Schaaf, Philadelphia City Planning Commission
Robert Thomas

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

Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor

ALSO PRESENT

Todd Sell, Meyer Design, Inc.
Yao Chang Huang, YCH Architect
Pui Tong Chin
Jeffery Hayes, Jeffery Hayes Architect
Adam Montalbano, MotoDesignShop
Richard Wesley, Wesley Architects
Ian Cope, Cope Linder Architects
Robert Ashton, Daroff Design
Stephen Beacham, Daroff Design
Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Dominick Fareri
Vincent Mancini, Landmark Architectural Design

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Sherman called the meeting to order at 9:03 a.m. Commissioners Benoliel, Jaffe, Jones, Leonard, Mattioni, Merriman, Palantino, Quinn, Schaaf, and Thomas joined him.

MINUTES OF THE 573RD STATED MEETING OF THE PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the minutes of the 573rd Stated Meeting of the Philadelphia Historical Commission, held 14 May 2010. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

THE REPORT OF THE ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 MAY 2010

vacant, Chair

CONSENT AGENDA

150 S. Independence Mall West
21 Summit Street
230-32 Hutchinson Street
Ridgeland Mansion, Chamounix Drive

Mr. Farnham presented the Consent Agenda to the Commission. Mr. Sherman asked if any Commissioners or members of the public wished to comment on the Consent Agenda. No one offered any comments.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendations of the Architectural Committee for 150 S. Independence Mall West, 21 Summit Street, 230-32 Hutchinson Street, and the Ridgeland Mansion on Chamounix Drive in Fairmount Park. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

133 N. 11TH STREET

Owner: Pui Tong Chin

Applicant: Yao Chang Huang, YCH Architects

History: c. 1840

Designation: Individually designated, 4/25/1974

Project: Demolish rear ell, wall, roof, and dormer, construct addition

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the first-floor front façade is restored to its early twentieth-century storefront appearance, with the staff to review details.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes demolition, alterations, and an addition at the rowhouse at 133 N. 11th Street. It proposes to demolish the rear wall of the main block at the second, third, and fourth floors, rear slope of the roof and dormer on the main block, and a small rear extension. The large, non-historic, one-story rear addition would be retained. A large, rear addition would be constructed at the second and third floors; a deck would sit on the addition. A new, nearly flat roof without dormer would be added to the rear half of the main block. The front façade would not be altered.

The rear of this building opens onto Clifton Street, a service alley. The proposed alterations would be visible from the alley and obliquely at a distance from Cherry Street.

At the Architectural Committee meeting, the Committee suggested that the applicants propose some restoration at the front façade to offset the demolition at the rear façade. The applicants subsequently amended their application to propose the rehabilitation of the storefront, which had been altered without review after designation but many years ago. A drawing of the

proposed storefront has been distributed. It includes a second doorway that does not appear in the photograph of the historic storefront. Also, the drawing does not note the materials of the storefront.

If the Commission accepts the compromise plan suggested by the Architectural Committee, it should be clear that it does not consider the work at the rear to constitute a demolition in the legal sense. The Commission must avoid the appearance of approving a demolition in exchange for other work.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Farnham presented the application to the Historical Commission. Property owner Pui Tong Chin and architect Yao Chang Huang represented the application.

Mr. Huang described the deteriorating conditions owing to water infiltration. He reported that the owner has been unable to rent the space because of the condition. He stated that his client is willing to restore the early twentieth-century storefront as suggested by the Architectural Committee. Mr. Sherman asked about the stucco and windows at the upper floors. Mr. Huang explained that his client does not have the resources to remove the stucco or replace the windows.

Mr. Thomas noted that the plan that was originally submitted showed two front doors side-by-side. The new storefront shows the doors separated by the shop window. He asked Mr. Huang if he intended to modify the interior plan to accommodate the storefront as shown. Mr. Huang stated that the interior would match the storefront. Mr. Schaaf noted that the storefront doors do not have proportions like historic doors. Messrs. Thomas and Sherman agreed and suggested that revising the door designs to look like historic doors. Mr. Huang stated that he would make the revision. Mr. Thomas stated that the staff could review the door details.

Mr. Schaaf asked about the rear alterations. Mr. Huang described the demolition and new construction. He stated that it is not possible to see the rear of the historic building over the one-story non-historic addition except from the nearby parking garage. He also noted that other buildings in this row already have very large additions. Mr. Huang explained that he will insert a ridge beam so that the historic front slope of the roof can be maintained in place. He also reported that he will keep the historic chimney in place.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and approve the application, provided the first-floor front façade is restored to its early twentieth-century storefront appearance, with the staff to review details. Mr. Schaaf seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

131 N. 20TH STREET

Owner: Dale You & Stephen Jay Tai

Applicant: Yao Chang Huang

History: c. 1860

Designation: individually designated, 4/28/1970

Project: Construct rear additions and deck

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the addition on the garage and the two new garage windows, but denial of the deck and stair tower addition.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct two additions at the rear of this property. One would be an addition to the non-historic rear garage. A roof deck with black metal railings would be constructed on this addition. The second would be an addition to a small stair tower for access to the deck. Both additions would be clad in stucco. This application also proposes to cut two new windows in the non-historic garage.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Yao Chang Huang represented the application.

Mr. Huang provided a brief overview of the project. He stated that the owner would like to convert the building from offices to apartment units. He informed the Commission that he has removed the proposed stair tower addition from the architectural drawings since the Architectural Committee meeting. He stated that the Committee objected to the stair tower addition. He stated that he is now proposing to access the deck directly from the interior.

Ms. Merriman asked about the set back of the deck from Cherry Street. Mr. Huang responded that the deck will be located 13'-6" from Cherry Street and any views of it will be blocked by an existing skylight. Mr. Farnham explained that the Architectural Committee did not object to the deck, but did object to the proposed stair tower addition to access the deck. The applicant has removed that stair tower from his design. Mr. Farnham stated that the staff confirmed that the garage is not historic, but is a much later stucco-clad addition.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to approve the revised application as presented to the Historical Commission on 11 June 2010, with the staff to review details. Ms. Benoliel seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

1910 SPRING GARDEN STREET

Owner: Robert D. Harvey

Applicant: John Bushnell

History: vacant lot; building at the time of designation, c. 1886; accidentally demolished during construction on adjacent lot in 2005

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

Project: In concept: Construct residential building

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept of the application, provided the height is limited to five stories.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes, in concept, to construct a six-story residential building on a vacant lot. A building stood on the lot at the time of designation. That building collapsed after its foundation was undermined during the construction of the building to the east at 1906-08

Spring Garden Street. The proposed building would be taller than the historic buildings on the block, but would be similar to the new building to the east, which the Commission approved. Also, the Commission approved a five-story building for this lot at 1910 Spring Garden Street in 2006; however, that building was not constructed.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Ian Cope represented the application.

Mr. Cope stated that this is an “in concept” proposal for a mixed-use building. The lot is 25 feet wide and has been vacant for three or four years. He pointed out the new building to the east. He stated that the building that stood on the subject lot was accidentally demolished when the new building to the east was under construction. Mr. Cope stated that there would be offices on the first floor and residential units above. The top unit would be a bi-level unit for the owner. He stated that the proposed building would match the proportions of the new construction on the adjacent lot, but would be distinguished with a different brick and a metal clad bay. Parking would be in the rear, with six spaces. He stated that the fifth floor would be a mansard and the sixth floor would be set back. The side and rear would be stucco. The Spring Garden Civic Association does not oppose the project. The Logan Square Neighbors has not responded.

Mr. Thomas asked about the sixth-floor setback. Mr. Cope replied that it would be a mansard. It is closer to Spring Garden Street than the penthouse on the building to the east, but that penthouse is a stucco box. This sixth floor is a finished mansard. He also stated that the rear set-back from Nectarine Street is the same as the building to the east.

Mr. Schaaf asked if the brick would be different from the brick on the block. Mr. Cope replied that it would not be radically different; it would be in the orange and red range. Mr. Cope stated that he would work with the staff to select an appropriate brick color. He would like the building to be differentiated from the building to the east. Mr. Sherman asked about the material at the base of the front façade. Mr. Cope stated that it would be a cast stone. He also noted that he would use a butter joint.

Ms. Merriman suggested that the Commission consider granting final approval of this application, given the detail provided. Mr. Farnham replied that he believes that it is within the discretion of the Commission to grant final approval, but he asked attorney Leonard Reuter to advise the Commission. Mr. Reuter recommended against granting a final approval today because the public had been notified of an in-concept review.

Mr. Thomas asked why the Architectural Committee had recommended denial. Ms. Cote explained that the Committee concluded that a six-story building would be too tall for this historic neighborhood. The Committee concluded that five stories were appropriate. Mr. Thomas stated that he had no objection to a sixth floor. Ms. Merriman concurred. Mr. Thomas noted that the side elevation will have three visible stories of stucco. He suggested that the applicant should consider treating this wall in such a way that breaks up the mass.

ACTION: Mr. Schaaf moved to approve the application in concept. Mr. Mattioni seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

333 S. 7TH STREET

Applicant: Vincent Corso

Owner: Richard Scafidi

History: 1831-39

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

Project: Rebuild chimney, replace watertable and bulkhead, alter windows and doors, etc.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of the chimney reconstruction, but approval of all other aspects of the revised application, which does not include the flower boxes, flag pole, and fire marker, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore and alter the exterior of this corner property. Restorations and repairs include the replacement of all windows with the appropriate wood, true-divided-light sash, restoration of marble watertable and cellar bulkhead, repair and replacement of original detail on the dormer, siding removal and repair of the brick cornice, roof and gutter replacement, and exterior repointing.

Currently, the east chimney is leaning southward and an engineer's report states that it is dangerous. The previous removal of all masonry support beneath the roof has compromised the stability of the seven-foot remaining portion of the chimney above the roof.

This application proposes to restore a third-story rear window opening on the main block, which provides access to a small deck, and create a new access to a deck by cutting a door opening at the corner where the rear ell meets the main block of the house.

The applicant also proposes to replace a window and sliding doors in non-historic openings at the first-story rear. These are not visible from the public right-of-way. The applicant proposes to replace a side gate, however, no information has been provided regarding its replacement.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Historical Commission. Architect Richard Wesley represented the application.

Mr. Sherman asked about the leaning chimney. Mr. Wesley stated that the chimney below the roof was removed by a former owner, but the portion above the roof was left in place, supported only by a light wood structure. The chimney is now six inches out of plumb and in danger of collapse. He stated that he is proposing to remove the rear portion of the chimney above the roof and rebuild the brick of the chimney along the street façade, but not the brick over the roof. If the Commission wants the mass of the chimney over the roof rebuilt, he proposes to rebuild it with stucco on a light frame. He contended that he cannot create a structure within the building to support a new brick chimney above the roof. He noted that he has provided an engineer's report.

Mr. Thomas rejected the proposal to erect a chimney that was only one brick wide. He suggested real brick on the exterior wall with a light structure and brick veneer behind it. Mr. Wesley stated that he had investigated this option with the engineer after the Architectural Committee meeting and concluded that it is feasible. Ms. Sell stated that she believes that such a proposal would satisfy the Standards. Mr. Wesley again noted that there is no way to support a real masonry mass, only a lightweight version of it. Mr. Sherman stated that they should reuse the old brick that is disassembled.

ACTION: Mr. Thomas moved to approve the revised application, which does not include the flower boxes, flag pole, and fire marker, provided the failing section of the chimney is reconstructed with a veneer of the original brick to match the exterior appearance of the original chimney, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, and 9. Ms. Leonard seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

170 S. INDEPENDENCE MALL WEST, CURTIS CENTER

Owner: Curtis Partners L.P.

Applicant: Thomas Citro

History: 1914, Edgar Seeler, architect

Designation: significant in Society Hill Historic District, 3/10/1999

Project: In-Concept: Install awnings and planters

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install awnings and planters within four window bays on the S. 7th Street or west elevation of the Curtis Building. The awnings would be made of an acrylic "Sunbrella" material in black. Two would be embellished with the logo "Cooperage A Wine and Whiskey Bar." The awnings would be anchored to the marble façade and bronze and steel windows with a series of bolts and screws. The proposed planters would sit within four bays on the granite base, however, no information has been provided regarding size, material, or attachment.

Built in 1914 by Edgar V. Seeler, the Curtis Building is one of the most important examples of Beaux Arts and Classical Revival architecture in the City of Philadelphia. The exterior signage and embellishment would disrupt the continuity of the unobstructed bays and overall symmetry of the 7th Street elevation.

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

Mr. Farnham explained that the attorney for the business owner had sent an email to the Commission acknowledging that his client had installed the awnings and planters without approvals or permits and stating that he would not contest a denial of the application.

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

150 SOUTH INDEPENDENCE MALL WEST, PUBLIC LEDGER BUILDING

Applicant: Robert Ashton, AIA LEED AP

Owner: CB Richard Ellis

History: 1926-27, Horace Trumbauer, architect

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

Project: Replace canopy

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace an existing bronze clad, steel, and glass canopy on Chestnut Street with a flat aluminum and glass canopy with an internally illuminated hanging aluminum drum. The new canopy would be eight feet from grade.

In April 2010, the Architectural Committee reviewed an application that proposed a curved, brushed metallic gray aluminum canopy with illuminated signage with acrylic letters. The large, solid massing of the canopy would cover the entry door transom. The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 5 and 9. The applicant subsequently withdrew the application.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

21 SUMMIT STREET

Owner: William & Jane Farran

Applicant: Jeffery Hayes

History: c. 1870

Designated: individually designated, 8/2/1973

Project: Construct rear deck

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a rear deck with trellis at the rear of this mid nineteenth-century suburban villa in Chestnut Hill. The rear of this property has been greatly altered from its original nineteenth-century appearance. The deck would be constructed in a portion of the rear façade that dates to the 1980s. An original rear window would be modified into a door. A small deck at the third-floor rear would be replaced in kind, and some window panel modifications are proposed to the 1980s addition. The application does not propose any work or alterations to the front façade on Summit Street.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

230-32 S. HUTCHINSON STREET

Owner: David Watt

Applicant: Adam Montalbano

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

Designation: individually designated, 1/31/1961

Project: Restore facades, construct roof deck

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the facades of these three properties that have been consolidated into one residence. The grouping consists of two early nineteenth-century residences on Hutchinson Street and one late nineteenth-century garage along Latimer Street. The application proposes the addition of a roof deck. The deck would be located on the garage and it would face away from the main façade of the two residential properties on Hutchinson. The deck would be accessed through a pilot house at the rear of the two houses on Hutchinson Street. The construction of the pilot house would necessitate some minor alterations to the rear

cornice and roof of the corner property. The pilot house would not be visible from any public right-of-way. The deck railing would be visible from Latimer Street.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

RIDGELAND MANSION, CHAMOUNIX DRIVE

Owner: City of Philadelphia

Applicant: Kimberly Hinkelman, Wellness Community

History: 1763

Designation: individually designated, 6/26/1956

Project: Construct addition to barn

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the faux barn doors flanking the entry doors at the addition are deleted, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct an addition to the barn at Ridgeland Mansion in Fairmount Park. The mansion and barn are occupied by the Wellness Community, a support center for cancer patients. The center is expanding its programs and must increase its square footage if it is to remain at this historic site. The applicant proposes a one-story addition of sympathetic design and materials. The proposed addition would be constructed on the side of the barn that faces away from the house. The proposed addition takes strong cues from the existing barn. The addition would rest on exposed stone piers, be clad in wood clap boards, and have a metal roof. A deck would be constructed at the rear of the addition, looking onto the woods surrounding the property.

ACTION: See the Consent Agenda.

OLD BUSINESS

2122 SHUNK STREET

Owners: Dominick and Maria Fareri

Applicant: Vincent Mancini, Landmark Architectural Design

History: 1915-16, James and John Windrim, architects

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

Project: Legalize demolition and rebuilding steps to a different design

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

OVERVIEW: The applicant proposes to legalize the rebuilding of the front steps of this twin house in Girard Estates. In 2005, the Commission received multiple calls from neighbors claiming that the historic steps of the building were being demolished and new steps were being built in their place. The staff visited and photographed the site and requested that the Department of Licenses & Inspections issue a stop work order. The work was not stopped because it constituted a potential tripping hazard; however, the owner was informed that a violation would be issued. Work continued and the steps were completed. The staff submitted written requests for violations in 2006 and 2009 as well as multiple times during that period by telephone. The original steps were a straight flight of concrete steps with brick railing walls. The new steps were

built entirely of brick with a flared shape. They do not match either the steps in the row or on the adjoining twin.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Historical Commission. Owner Dominick Fareri and architect Vincent Mancini represented the application.

Mr. Mancini stated that his client constructed the steps in 2005 or 2006. Mr. Fareri recalled that an inspector had stopped by during the construction, but had not indicated that anything was wrong. He stated that he did not receive a violation notice until December 2009, three or four years after the steps were completed. Mr. Sherman asked him how long he has owned the property. He replied that he owned it for 30 years. Mr. Sherman asked him if he knew that it was designated as historic. He replied that he had intended to rebuild the steps before the designation. A divorce delayed him from rebuilding the steps. Mr. Baron noted that the district was designated on 10 November 1999. The Commission sent the standard notice letters to Mr. Fareri.

Mr. Mancini introduced numerous photographs of “non-conforming” steps in the neighborhood; he conceded that the photographs may have no bearing on the case. He stated that, after hearing the Commission’s position, he reserved the right to offer some potential remedies. Mr. Sherman responded that any remedy would require the complete demolition of the steps. Ms. Merriman added that she perceived this as a simple matter. The steps were rebuilt illegally on the front of a designated house without any approvals or permits in a non-compliant manner and should be restored to their original design. Mr. Mancini noted that it has been claimed that a stop-work order was issued during the reconstruction of the steps. He stated that his client claims that no such order was ever issued. Mr. Baron explained that the Commission has a full record of its and the Department of Licenses & Inspection’s activities during this project. He stated that the Department did not stop the reconstruction of the steps midway because it did not want to allow a trip hazard, but instead informed the owner that a permit and Commission approval were required and should be sought immediately. Mr. Baron stated that the Commission requested a stop-work order and violation; the violation was issued, but the stop-work order was not owing to the potential tripping hazard. Mr. Baron also noted that this building is one of a twin and the symmetry is important. Mr. Quinn, the representative of the Department of Licenses & Inspections on the Commission, explained that building inspectors often issue verbal stop-work orders and other directives at construction sites. He stated that in a case like this, the inspector would have ordered the contractor to abate any dangerous conditions and then seek the appropriate approvals and permits before continuing with the work.

Ms. Jaffe noted that neighbors had called the Commission to complain about the illegal work during the construction. Mr. Fareri introduced petitions from his neighbors stating they had no objections to the stairs as built. Mr. Sherman commented that the petitions were irrelevant because the petitioners were not judging the illegal work based on the Secretary of Interior’s Standards. Mr. Sherman suggested reconstructing the steps to accurately reflect the historical configuration. He noted that the staff can review and approve an application that proposes restoring the steps. Mr. Fareri stated that he reconstructed the steps in 2005. He asked about the date of designation of the historic district. Mr. Sherman responded that the district was designated in 1999, bringing this house under the Commission’s jurisdiction.

Mr. Mancini asked if he could present a proposal to rework the existing steps to better reflect the historic steps. Mr. Sherman stated that he would welcome a proposal to correct the illegally modified steps. He advised the applicants that the staff could review an application to restore

the steps. Mr. Mancini stated that the brick steps could be refaced in white stucco or cement to make them look more like the historic steps. He stated that there are similar steps in the neighborhood. Mr. Sherman contended that the other steps in the neighborhood like these were installed before designation. He explained that the Commission does not unilaterally require owners to undertake restoration work, but does review projects proposed by owners to ensure that the work is compliant with historic preservation standards. Mr. Mancini observed that the historic steps may not meet the building code for tread and riser width and height. Mr. Sherman responded that the staff can assist the applicants in designing steps that satisfy historic preservation and building code standards. Mr. Mancini stated that his client would like to remove the curved wing walls, construct straight wing walls, cover the brick steps with cement, and add planters. Mr. Sherman advised the applicants to submit the plan to the staff. He advised the applicants to consult with the staff before they spend any more time or money.

ACTION: Ms. Merriman moved to adopt the recommendation of the Architectural Committee and deny the application, pursuant to Standard 6. Mr. Thomas seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

ACTION: Mr. Sherman moved to adjourn at 10:25 a.m. Mr. Mattioni 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.