

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

**TUESDAY, 23 JULY 2013
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP, chair
Nan Gutterman
John Cluver, AIA, LEED AP
Rudy D'Alessandro
Dan McCoubrey, AIA, LEED AP BD+C
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein, AIA, LEED AP

Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner II
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III

ALSO PRESENT

Ben Leech, Preservation Alliance
Rafael Lissack
Carol Lissack
Richard Cole
Joan Cole
John Manza, Drexel University
Vincent DiMaria, Drexel University
Margaret Shin, Drexel University
Patrick Baker, Drexel University
Dominic Lacivita, Drexel University
Ronald Tyson, Drexel University
Zoe Spenbeck, Drexel University
Daniel Tapia, Drexel University
Nathan Barry, Drexel University
Jeffrey Peters, Drexel University
Jessica Scheeler, Drexel University
Kevin Yoder, k Yoder Design
Kathy Dowdell
Susan Warren
Harvey Young
Larry Spector
Ryan Lohbauer
Charles Burke
Stephen Potts
Eric D. Stewart
Charles Alcorn
Anthony Brucello
Jeremy LeCompe
Robert Zambrano
David Sim

**ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JULY 2013
PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION
PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES**

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 252, 254, AND 256 S 03RD ST

Project: Replace front steps

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Richard & Joan Cole

Applicant: Richard Cole, Richard M. Cole & Associates

History: 1960

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: These applications propose to remove the original, pre-cast concrete front entrance steps with a bullnose profile and replace them with granite steps with a squared profile at three redevelopment-era townhouses in Society Hill.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the applications to the Architectural Committee. Property owners Richard Cole and Rafael Lissack represented the applications.

Mr. Cole stated that this row of houses was built in 1968. He stated that three of them have the same front entrance steps made of pre-cast concrete. He stated the steps have deteriorated over the years. He stated that they tried patching them and that the steps at his house were covered in a cement coating that is now falling apart. He stated that they did not want to go back to the pre-cast steps, owing to the deterioration issues. He stated that did not want to install marble steps because the stone is too soft. Therefore, they opted for granite. He stated that they cannot get the granite steps with a bullnose profile; therefore, they are proposing square-edge steps. He stated that square-edge steps can be found up and down S. 3rd Street, and in fact, appear to be the majority.

Mr. D'Alessandro stated that he believes that one can obtain granite with a bullnose. Mr. Cole stated that the quarry can only fabricate steps with the bullnose in two pieces, which is very expensive. Mr. Lissack stated that they decided that the granite would be a better material.

Mr. Cluver asked if granite could be found anywhere else on these houses, such as the trim. Mr. Lissack replied that there is no granite anywhere else. Mr. Cluver asked if the trim elements are pre-cast concrete. Mr. Cole stated that there are, but they are not exposed aggregate concrete like the concrete of the steps. Ms. Hawkins stated that these steps are horizontal surfaces that are exposed to more weather and wear. They are 45 years old and are due to be replaced.

Mr. Cluver stated that pre-cast concrete is readily available and there is no reason why pre-cast concrete cannot be used. He stated that the current pre-cast steps have had an almost 50-year life span. He stated that granite would constitute a noticeable change. Ms. Gutterman agreed and stated that granite would be inappropriate, especially since it is not found elsewhere on the building. Mr. Cluver stated that the proposed steps would change the appearance of these houses. Mr. McCoubrey stated that he appreciated the choice of granite, which he would

consider himself, but contended that the original steps really are a character-defining feature of the building and should be replicated.

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

ADDRESS: 293 LOCUST ST

Project: Legalize installation of sliding doors

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Paul Trower

Applicant: Kevin Yoder, k Yoder Design, LLC

History: 1962, I.M. Pei & Associates, architect, Society Hill Townhouses

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the installation of three sliders on the second floor in this I.M. Pei designed townhouse in Society Hill. The new sliders deviate from the original in that the operable slider has a latch with a wider stile on one side, making the sliders asymmetrical.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Kevin Yoder represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins asked about the dimensions of the original window. Mr. Yoder stated that the removed window was stained glass and not original. He stated that he lives in the complex and explained that he and other owners have been trying to return the complex to its original appearance. He stated that it is common to find that the original sliders have been replaced with shorter sliders with transoms.

Ms. Hawkins asked if there was an original slider surviving in the complex or if the original architectural drawings exist. Mr. Yoder responded that the original drawings for the complex do exist, but they are single-line drawings and do not detail the dimensions of the sliders. Ms. Hawkins observed that the original rails and stiles of the frames were consistent all around and the sliders were symmetrical. The sliders that were installed have a larger four- to six-inch jamb and stile on one side. Mr. Yoder stated that most sliders are larger on the one side in order to accommodate a latch.

Ms. Cote supplied the Committee with the designation photograph of 283 S. 3rd Street, which shows what appears to be the original slider. She stated that she walked around the complex with Mr. Yoder and had difficulty locating an original slider. She stated that the specific dimensions of the original slider are unknown.

Mr. Yoder stated that, over the years, owners within the complex have used the manufacturer of the new slider because it can make custom windows for nine-foot openings. He stated that he thought this window would be fine, given that a number of them have been installed and are the window of choice for the complex. He reiterated that a latch typically requires a wider stile. Ms. Hawkins stated that she did not know enough about sliders to know whether or not the jamb

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JULY 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

needs to be substantially wider. She asked if other Committee members did. Mr. Yoder stated that he asked the manufacturer if it could make them narrower and it replied that it would not warranty a window with a latch and narrow stile. The company asserted that sliders over seven-foot nine-inches require a wider stile. Ms. Gutterman stated that she believes that another manufacturer may be able to make a slider that more closely matches the original. Ms. Hawkins stated that committing to one manufacturer may create the problem. She stated that she had never seen a stile this wide to accommodate a locking mechanism. Ms. Gutterman stated that part of the problem is the asymmetry. Mr. Yoder stated that the stile is one inch wider than he had anticipated.

Ms. Cote pointed out that there were three locations on this building where the sliders have been installed. She showed the Committee a photograph depicting the visibility of the slider on the side of the building. Mr. Yoder stated that there is also a slider on the rear elevation that faces the courtyard. Ms. Hawkins asked if the courtyard is accessed to the public. Mr. Yoder stated that the courtyard is locked and gated. Ms. Hawkins asked if the rear can be seen from the gate of the courtyard. Mr. Yoder said that it could not. Mr. Baron asked if any fronts face the courtyard. Mr. Yoder responded that only rears face the courtyard.

Mr. Cluver stated that the fundamental question is whether anyone manufactures a slider with a latch and narrower stile. He suggested to the architect that seek the information answering that question and provide it to the Commission at its meeting. He stated that the change to a wider stile appears rather insignificant, but has a significant impact on the appearance. He noted that research can determine if this is the only option, or if other designs are available. He concluded that, if there is a more appropriate window, then it should be used.

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

ADDRESS: 312 MARKET ST

Project: Construct fire stair enclosure

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: 312 Market Street Inc.

Applicant: Kim Derstein, 312 Market Inc.

History: 1850

Individual Designation: 11/4/1976

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes an addition to the side façade of the building facing Franklin Court. Although the brownstone faced building faces Market Street, it has what appears to be an earlier brick rear ell, which makes up the east side of Franklin Court. The windows have been closed up, the upper floors sealed off, and the interior stairs removed in that section of the building, which currently houses the kitchen of a restaurant. To use the upper floors of the building, the application proposes opening the windows and building an exterior, enclosed stair addition. The opening of the windows will restore some of the appearance of the side façade. The application proposes an exterior stair because an interior stair is infeasible; the existing kitchen fit-outs and cold storage room preclude the construction of the stair without rebuilding the kitchen and disrupting the business. The plans show the construction of a stair addition covered with masonry board siding and a standing-seam roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the stair addition is revised to follow the rise of the stairs, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the project.

Mr. Baron explained that he had been to the property to look for alternative locations for the stairs within the building envelope. The walk-in refrigerator and other built-in equipment block the better locations for the stairs. Using the section drawing of the proposed stairs, he explained how the addition could be reduced in size by following the slope of the stairs. Ms. Hawkins said that she was not comfortable with approving an inappropriate exterior addition based on previous choices that the owner made for the interior layout. The Committee members pointed out that there appears to be an alternative location for the stair on the side of the building opposite Franklin Court. Mr. Baron asked the Committee about the reopening of the windows. Ms. Gutterman said that she thought the whole application should be looked at as a package and not in pieces.

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

ADDRESS: 601-03 LOMBARD ST

Project: Construct multi-family building

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Pamela Ying Jin & James Nga Kuk

Applicant: Stephan Potts, Stanev Potts Architects

History: 1981

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a four-story, six-unit residential building on a site that is currently a parking lot. The site is located on Addison Street, at the rears of two Lombard Street houses designated as Contributing to the Society Hill Historic District. The applicants are seeking to subdivide the parking lot from the Lombard Street parcel. The Commission has full plenary jurisdiction because the parking lot is not undeveloped, but was part of the developed Lombard Street parcel at the time of designation. Also, the inventory indicates that the lot has archaeological potential, even though it classifies the parking lot as Non-contributing.

The proposed structure would be clad in grey brick and white stucco and have very large windows. It is generally compatible with the historic district in massing and footprint. The materials, however, are not in keeping with the red brick of the neighborhood and the details such as scale of windows and arrangement of the first floor are at variance with much of the building's context.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval in concept of the massing and footprint, but denial of final approval, owing to the incompatible materials and detailing, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application. Architects Stephan Potts and Ryan Lohbauer and Charles Burke represented the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JULY 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Mr. Baron explained that the inventory for the Society Hill Historic District has discrepancies regarding this property. The official City address of the site for permitting purposes is 601-603 Lombard Street. With the subdivision, the new lot will have the address 600-602 Addison Street, but that address is not official yet. The Society Hill Historic District inventory lists the houses on Lombard as one address and the parking lot on Addison as another, even though the entirety of the property currently has one official address. The inventory uses the address 601-05 Lombard Street, not 601-03, for the houses and classifies it as Contributing. It uses the address 600-02 Addison Street for the parking lot and classifies it as Non-contributing, but also notes that it has archaeological potential. Mr. Baron suggested that the property is developed, not undeveloped, and the Commission therefore has full jurisdiction. However, he advised that the Commission should make the final determination regarding advisory or plenary jurisdiction. He suggested that the Committee offer a recommendation that can be used in either scenario.

Mr. Baron also noted that the Commission received a letter from Lorna Katz-Lawson, the chair of the Zoning and Historic Preservation Committee of the Society Hill Civic Association. In the letter, she expresses the committee's opposition to the project.

Mr. Potts said that they had met with the neighbors. He explained that the zoning for the project for a multi-unit apartment building is as of right. He explained that the materials of the proposed building do relate to the cream stone and grey slate roof of the church across the street. He pointed to a stucco sample to say that the color will be gray. He said that the houses to the north and south are of recent vintage and not historic. The surrounding houses are clad with a mix of different red brick. The large windows shown in the design were added to give lightness to the wall surfaces. The narrow windows of the first floor were designed to provide privacy.

Ms. Hawkins pointed out that the plans are not consistent with the elevations. Mr. Potts said that the line drawing elevation is the most accurate of the drawings. Mr. Cluver said that the massing and color of the new building seems inconsistent with the surrounding buildings. Mr. McCoubrey thought that the bays looked particularly massive because they are solid rather than fenestrated, like most bays. He suggested that the design could be both modern and contextual. Mr. Potts said that he has tried to break down the cube and he thinks that his design is contextual.

Mr. Baron explained that, although the staff objected to the materials and detailing, it recommended in favor of a conceptual approval of the massing and footprint because the four-story building was basically in keeping with the rowhouses in the 600 block of Lombard Street, the church, and the school that historically stood at this site. He clarified that the Redevelopment-Era rowhouses are considered historically significant in this district.

Mr. Cluver said that he thinks that there is some precedent for this size, but that the materials accentuate the size very aggressively.

The Committee asked for public comment. Larry Spector, a neighbor, speaking for himself and his wife Ann, stated that there would be a loss of parking and that the proposed exterior materials are inconsistent with the neighborhood. Mr. Spector submitted three letters from neighbors in opposition to the project.

Eric Stewart, a trustee representing Mother Bethel Church, expressed a concern with loss of parking as well as noise and views. He said that the church's sanctuary is at the second-floor level and would look out at the rooftop and air conditioners of the new building. Mr. Potts

explained that the rooftop mechanical equipment would be screened for noise and view and would be set away from the front façade.

Mel Buckman, a neighbor at 641 Addison Street, contended that the new building would be out of character with the neighborhood and would not satisfy the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Richard Ostrander, a neighbor at 408 S. 6th Street, claimed that the new building would be totally out of character with its context.

David Blair, a neighbor at 610 Addison Street, said that the new building would block the beautiful light shining through the stained glass windows at Mother Bethel and would turn a blank wall towards Addison Street.

Ms. Hawkins clarified for the community that the Commission's jurisdiction does not extend to parking or other zoning matters, but is instead focused on the compatibility of the proposed building with the historic district.

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

ADDRESS: 113 GAY ST

Project: Rehabilitate building

Type of Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: James Mitchell

Applicant: Rustin Ohler, Harman Deutsch

History: 1900

Individual Designation: None

District Designation: Main Street Manayunk Historic District, Contributing, 12/14/1983

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to rehabilitate two buildings in the Manayunk Historic District. The buildings were unsympathetically altered in the past and retain little of their original appearance. The project includes the three-story building on the corner of Cresson and Gay Streets and the adjacent two-story building on Cresson Street. The Cresson Street facades face SEPTA elevated train tracks.

The Historical Commission reviewed and approved in concept a very similar application in June 2007. At that time, the Commission approved the rehabilitation of the two buildings and the construction of a one-story addition on the two-story building, the construction of a large bay window on Gay Street, and penthouse additions on both the two-story and corner buildings. That project was not undertaken.

The current proposal is a scaled-back version of the June 2007 approval. The current proposal would also rehabilitate the two buildings. The existing rough-stucco finish would be removed and replaced with a smooth-stucco finish. The original window openings would be reopened and aluminum-clad windows installed. The garage opening on Cresson Street would be retained and the garage door replaced with a storefront system. The garage opening on Gay Street would be eliminated and replaced with a double residential-scaled window. The cornice would be reconstructed. The current application also proposes an addition on the two-story building. The

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 23 JULY 2013

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

addition would match the height of the adjacent three-story building and have a six-inch set back from the front façade along Cresson Street. The addition would be finished in stucco and have two windows. The proposed addition is more sympathetic than the previously approved addition. The previous addition was taller and did not respect the height of the three-story building. It was also clad in a glass storefront system and did not have a setback. A roof deck is proposed over the addition. The roof deck would have an eight-foot set back from Cresson Street and a pilothouse for access. Owing to the elevated train tracks the roof deck and pilothouse would not be visible from Cresson Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standard 9 and the June 2007 approval.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Anthony Brucello and Jeremy LeCompe represented the project,

Ms. Gutterman asked to see the documents from the conceptual approval of 2007. Mr. Danta distributed the approved conceptual drawing to the Committee members.

Ms. Hawkins noted that the current drawings propose two different materials for the cornice repairs. Mr. LeCompe explained that the existing cornice is mostly rotted and capped with vinyl. He stated that the proposal would be to remove the rotted cornice and replace it with a PVC replica. Ms. Hawkins asked the reason for retaining the cornice at the two-story building. Mr. LeCompe answered that it would be retained as an indicator of the original height of the building. He stated that the intent is to provide a visual delineation between the original and the new. Ms. Hawkins asked if the garage opening would be enlarged to accommodate the proposed storefront system. Mr. LeCompe answered that the proposed storefront would fit within the existing garage opening.

Ms. Gutterman asked why the finish of the stucco would be changed from rough to smooth. Mr. LeCompe answered that smooth stucco is proposed for aesthetic reasons and to enhance the building. Ms. Stein asked if there were other stuccoed buildings in the neighborhood. Mr. LeCompe answered that there are several stuccoed facades in the immediate neighborhood. He noted that the underlying masonry on the subject property could not be exposed, and that the exterior walls must be stuccoed. Ms. Gutterman stated that smooth stucco is more difficult to apply than a rough finish. Mr. McCoubrey noted that the front slope of the pilothouse is too shallow for a shingle roof. He suggested a metal roof for that location. Ms. Gutterman asked if aluminum windows were acceptable for this project. Mr. Danta answered that aluminum-clad windows have been approved in similar applications when the building is greatly altered and the rehabilitation does not propose a full restoration. Mr. D'Alessandro suggested that the new windows should be installed deeper within the opening and without a bullnose detail on the stucco. He suggested that all corners should be sharp and that all windows should have window sills.

Mr. Danta asked the applicants if they were in agreement with revising the application to reflect the comments expressed by the Committee members. Mr. LeCompe and Mr. Brucello answered that they were in agreement.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the material of the replacement cornice is consistent on both buildings, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADDRESS: 2501 S GARNET ST

Project: Install gate

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Robert & Laurie Zambrano

Applicant: Robert Zambrano

History: 1910; James H. and John T. Windrim, architects

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize a parking pad. The owner was erroneously informed by the Department of Licenses & Inspections that the construction of a parking pad did not require a building permit. The owner secured a zoning approval before beginning the work.

The parking pad is located on the rear yard of this corner property. The house did not retain the original hairpin fence. The rear yard was enclosed by a non-historic cinderblock wall, which the owner demolished. The property owner submitted an application in February 2013. The Commission denied the legalization. In April 2013, the Commission approved a similar application for 2535 S. 19th Street, also in the Girard Estate Historic District. That application involved the modification of the original hair-pin fence for the installation of a gate to access the parking pad.

The owner of the subject property appealed the Commission's February 2013 denial to the Board of License & Inspection Review. The Board heard the case and in light of the approval for a similar application for 2535 S. 19th Street remanded the application back to the Historical Commission. The owner now returns to the Commission with a revised application. The current application seeks to legalize the parking pad and the approval of a gate. The design of the gate has been revised since February 2013. The revised gate would have a solid panel in its lower section.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Commission's approval for 2535 S. 19th Street.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Robert Zambrano represented the application.

Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee previously recommended approval, provided that the gate is solid, but the Commission denied the application. Mr. Zambrano concurred and stated that he now presents a revised proposal that reflects the Committee's recommendation. He explained that he would still like to install a wrought iron fence. He noted that the only problem with a solid gate is that graffiti can become an issue. He stated that he would prefer to make the gate less solid, and as such, is proposing solid panels in the lower section of the gate only. Ms. Hawkins stated that the Committee's suggestion of a solid gate stemmed from the desire to match the existing solid concrete wall. She noted that the Commission approved alterations to an original hairpin fence for parking and that the hairpin fence allows far more visibility than the gate Mr. Zambrano is proposing.

Ms. Stein noted that the proposed fence has a curved design. She suggested that the design for the gate be revised to make it straight. She explained that the hairpin fences in the neighborhood do not have curved designs. Mr. Zambrano explained that the curved design is

proposed to match the gate in the adjacent property. Ms. Pentz asked if the existing opening in the concrete block wall would have to be widened to accommodate the proposed gate. Mr. Zambrano answered that it would not be widened, and that the gate would be hung from iron posts within the opening. Mr. Cluver asked about the height of the gate. Mr. Zambrano answered that it would be less than six feet, and that the gate would be same height as the wall. He noted that the height is for security reasons.

Ms. Hawkins asked the applicant if he would accept the recommendation to eliminate the curved design and make the top of the gate straight. Mr. Zambrano answered that he accepted the recommendation.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the top of the gate is straight, not curved, and that the height of the gate does not exceed the height of the wall, with the staff to review details, pursuant to the Commission's approval for 2535 S. 19th Street.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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.