

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

**27 MARCH 2007
CITY HALL ROOM 578
9:30 A.M.**

PRESENT

Suzanne Pentz
Robert Thomas, AIA
Herb Levy

Jonathan Farnham, Acting Historic Preservation Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Specialist
Jorge Danta, Historic Preservation Planner
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner
Karen Gonski, Administrative Technician

ALSO PRESENT

David Slovic, DSA
John Gallery, Preservation Alliance
Amie Leighton, Daley & Jalboot Architects
Van Potteiger, Van Potteiger Architects
Joe Romano
Mary Beth Gallo
Mathew Millan, Mask & Wig Club
Nancy Needham
Richard Thom, R.W. Thom Architects
Mitchell Harding
Vasily Kolemik, Lifeway Baptist Church
John Loonstyn, Loonstyn Property

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Thomas called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Ms. Pentz and Mr. Levy joined him on the Architectural Committee.

1213-15 LOCUST STREET

Owner/Applicants: David & Ligia Slovic
History: 1896, Frank Miles Day, architect
Project: legalize doors and skylights

OVERVIEW: This application seeks to legalize the installation of two skylights on top of the dormers as well as the removal of historic varnished oak doors and frames and their replacement with flush metal doors and frames. The applicant now proposes to apply a painted wood veneer and panels onto the illegal metal doors. The Commission had approved an interior-only permit application for this property that explicitly excluded any exterior work; nonetheless, the applicant undertook the exterior work. Although the applicant claims that the

doors were not the original doors, but later replacements, historic documents indicate that the removed doors matched the originals.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Legalization of the skylights; denial of the legalization of the doors, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Committee. Owner and architect David Slovic represented the application.

Mr. Slovic stated that he would paint the doors a dark blue color to match the other trim on the building. Painted in a dark color, the non-historic doors would recede. He also stated that he would apply moldings to the doors to make them appear like the originals. He asserted that this would be an appropriate solution.

Mr. Baron reported to the Committee that he had visited the site on his way to the meeting. He stated that conditions at the doorways would make the applicant's proposal infeasible because he has just added a very wide doorbell and security panel. The panel encroaches on the area where the frame molding should be located. He also noted that the applied moldings would not accurately reflect the original doors. He also objected to the painting of the doors. He explained that the original doors had been stained, not painted. The stained woodwork was a hallmark of this style.

Mr. Levy deemed the proposal acceptable, but Mr. Thomas objected, stating that the Committee must apply the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He contended that the proposal for the doors does not meet the Standards; the Committee should recommend denial.

Ms. Pentz asked Mr. Slovic if he had saved the doors recently removed. Mr. Baron noted that he had called Mr. Slovic during the illegal work and had asked him to retain the doors until the matter was resolved. Mr. Slovic stated that he had disposed of the doors. He claimed that they were not original, but dated to a 1980s renovation. Mr. Baron displayed photographs of the original and removed doors and commented that they appeared identical.

Mr. Baron reported to the Committee that Mr. Slovic had recently installed a large doorbell system that would prevent the realization of his proposal. He asked Mr. Slovic how much brick he had removed for the bell. He replied that he had removed pieces of brick measuring 9 inches by 13 inches. Mr. Baron noted that this work was executed without a permit as well.

Mr. Baron questioned the durability of the proposed veneer. He stated that it would not faithfully replicate the original doors. Mr. Slovic replied that he was attempting to recreate the look of the doors with veneer and molding.

Mr. Slovic acknowledged the illegal work and explained that it was undertaken quickly after a security breach at the building.

Mr. Levy stated again that the Committee should recommend approval of the door proposal and let the staff negotiate the details with the applicant. Mr. Thomas objected again and reminded Mr. Levy that the Committee should base its review on the Standards. He noted that the proposal does not satisfy the Standards and a recommendation of approval would set a regrettable precedent. He noted that the Committee always recommends wood doors in such instances. Ms. Pentz agreed and stated that she is not convinced that the veneer and moldings

would accurately replicate the original doors. Mr. Baron reminded the Committee that the illegal metal doors are not installed in the historic positions.

The Committee turned its attention to the skylights. Mr. Thomas and Ms. Pentz agreed that they are not visible to the public and therefore meet the Standards. Mr. Levy objected to the skylights because he believes that they will not drain well. He suggested that they be reconfigured for better drainage. His fellow Committee members suggested that the drainage was not a preservation issue.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend the legalization of the skylights, but denial of the legalization of the doors, pursuant to Standard 6.

6333 MALVERN AVENUE, 64TH AND MALVERN, OVERBROOK SCHOOL FOR THE BLIND

Applicant: Daniel Jalboot, Daley & Jalboot Architects

History: 1897-1900, Cope & Stewardson, architects

Project: Construct aquatic center

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a building for an aquatic center. It would be adjacent to the main historic building and within the walls of the historic complex. Eventually, an old pool building will be demolished, but that demolition is not part of this application. The new building will attach to a 1960s-era structure. The aquatic center will be positioned close to the historic main building and the street and will preempt some views of the main building. The primary façade material will be Hardi Plank or a similar cementitious molded board. The architecture of the proposed building relates to the nearby non-historic buildings, but not the historic structures.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9. The building should be “differentiated from the old and compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.”

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Amie Leighton represented the application.

Mr. Baron described the historic buildings on the campus, which were designed by the important Cope & Stewardson firm. He displayed an aerial photograph to indicate the location proposed for the new building.

Ms. Leighton summarized the material and color choices for the building. She explained that the locations and sizes of the windows were dictated by the needs of the partially sighted students. She noted that the design, especially the windows, accounts for their acute sensitivity to light. She reported that some are even allergic to light.

Mr. Thomas observed that it is difficult to assess the impact of the proposed construction on the historic campus with the materials submitted. He stated that, despite the lack of information, he believes that this new building will not be detrimental to the historic campus. He stated that it attaches to and integrates with non-historic buildings and does not preclude the primary views of the historic buildings. He also observed that the tall historic wall partially blocks the view of the new building. Mr. Levy and Ms. Pentz agreed with Mr. Thomas and concluded that the new

building will satisfy the school's strict programmatic requirements without negatively impacting the historic setting.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval as submitted.

129 N. 10th Street

Owner: Tung On Association

Applicant: Leon Lee

History: c. 1825, individually designated in 1984

glazed brick façade and storefront added by this owner without a permit

Project: Rehabilitate building, rebuild front façade, demolish and rebuild rear ell

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to convert this rowhouse to offices and apartments. The glazed brick façade and storefront would be removed and the original façade restored. The rear ell would be demolished and rebuilt in a wider form. The rear is visible only from a narrow alley.

The architectural plans included with this submission are incomplete. They are not to scale and do not provide complete information about the demolition and reconstruction of the front façade and rear ell. The proposal for the historic main-block roof is ambiguous. The staff has met with the applicant and his architect on numerous occasions to discuss the documentation, but they have not produced complete or accurate plans.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial as submitted, owing to incompleteness; approval in concept.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the proposal to the Committee. Leon Li and current owner Linda Carter represented the application.

Mr. Li explained that his organization would like to rehabilitate the building as a senior citizens residence. He intends to restore the front façade to its original appearance.

Ms. Pentz acknowledged the applicant's intent to restore, but remarked that the submitted drawings do not reflect a restoration. She noted many problems with the plans for the front façade. She contended that it could not be built as represented in the drawing. Mr. Levy agreed and stated that the drawings must be improved.

Mr. Baron suggested that the Committee recommend approval in concept, but requested that the applicant provide additional information before a final approval. He asked the applicant if the gable roof would be retained or replaced. Mr. Li stated that he was unsure of his architect's plans for the roof, but he guaranteed the Committee that he would comply with their suggestions and guidance. Messrs. Levy and Thomas suggested that the applicant provide an accurate representation of the proposal. Mr. Thomas noted, for example, that the sizes of the windows portrayed in the architectural drawings are inaccurate. Mr. Baron informed the Committee that he has been advising the applicant and his architect on this project for two years and the plans are still incomplete and inaccurate. He asked the Committee not to recommend approval of the project with the staff to review details; he asserted that the staff has been unable to elicit the details from the architect.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial as submitted, owing to incompleteness, but approval in concept.

310-312 QUINCE STREET

Owner: The Mask & Wig Club of the University of Pennsylvania

Applicant: Mathew Millan

History: c. 1834, rehabilitated as clubhouse by Wilson Eyre in 1894 and 1904

interior artwork by Maxfield Parrish, designated 2/28/1961

Project: Add climate control system, rehabilitate exterior

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations to the Mask & Wig Club, a drama club associated with the University of Pennsylvania, in Washington Square West. The club is installing a climate control system and an elevator. The club, which houses a theater for live performances, currently lacks air conditioning and ventilation. Owing to the highly significant interior, which includes numerous Maxfield Parrish paintings, Mercer tiles, and other outstanding features, and also the live performance space, the design of the climate control system has been considered very carefully. It has been designed to minimize both disruptions to the historic spaces and noise in the performance space.

The majority of the work would take place in the interior of the building. In addition to the ducting and other climate control equipment, the interior work would include the installation of an elevator, which would be located at the northeast corner of the building. Two windows would be modified in the interior to accommodate the elevator shaft. However, the exterior appearances of the windows would not change.

Most of the exterior modifications would occur at the sides and roof. At the front façade, only a code-mandated fire alarm bell would be installed. A Fire Department connection would be installed in the sidewalk in front of the building. Two vent caps and an air intake grille would be installed on the north facade. Three vent caps would be installed on the south facade. These modifications would be inconspicuous. The most visible modifications would be the alterations to the roof for mechanical equipment. The applicant proposes to install three HVAC relief hoods along the northern slope of the roof. In addition the applicant proposes to install three condensing units on a platform on the roof. A section of the roof gable at the rear of the building would be removed and a platform with railing added. The building is built out to the property lines at the east, south and west. A narrow fire egress alley borders the building at the north. There is no open space for the installation of the mechanical equipment at grade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Owing to her firm's involvement in the project, Ms. Pentz recused. Mr. Danta explained that the Committee lacked a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum. Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Architect Matthew Millan, who is a member of the Board of Governors of the Mask & Wig Club, represented the application.

Mr. Millan provided a detailed history of the building beginning with its construction in 1834 as one of the first African-American churches in the city. After the church disbanded, the building was converted into stable. In 1894, it was purchased by the club, which commissioned famous architect Wilson Eyre to rehabilitate it as a clubhouse with barroom and auditorium. Eyre constructed an addition in 1904. Famous painter Maxfield Parrish was commissioned to paint caricatures of the early members, a triptych for the barroom, and scenes around the proscenium arch at the stage. Although the front façade displays the Arts & Crafts/Rathskellar style of the interior, the primary architectural and aesthetic significance is found in the interior. The interior spaces are noted for their importance in the National Register nomination for the property.

Mr. Millan explained the need for climate control and provided a detailed explanation of the proposed HVAC system, which was designed to protect the important interiors and reduce noise. He explained several alternative systems explored by the club and its consultants. He noted that they employed an acoustical engineer to eliminate excess noise; the engineer determined that the units could not be mounted on the roof over the theater. They employed a structural engineer to determine if the units could hang from the north side of the building; they could not.

Mr. Millan stated that the climate control system will help preserve the important artworks. It will also allow up to 225 people to enjoy performances in the theater throughout the year. Mr. Millan stated that the west gable end of the building as well as a few feet of the roof would remain intact to the west of the cut for the platform.

Mr. Levy asked if the compressors on the platform could be reconfigured to be closer together to reduce visibility. Mr. Millan responded that they have considered every possible configuration and this is the only one that works. The mechanical units require open space around them for air circulation. After a lengthy discussion about alternatives, Messrs. Thomas and Levy agreed that the applicant has proposed the best solution in light of the many constraints. They noted that the roof could be rebuilt at a later date. They agreed that the most important goal was the preservation of the highly significant interior. Mr. Farnham agreed. He stated that the staff was initially concerned about the roof modification, but, after visiting the site, discussing the alternatives, and reviewing the extensive investigations undertaken by the applicant, was convinced that this was the best approach. The Committee members praised the applicant for his diligent research and analysis.

RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

419 S. 3RD STREET

Owner/Applicant: Mary Gallo and Joseph Romano

History: c. 1825, altered c. 1961, new façade c. 1975

contributing in Society Hill Historic District, designated 3/10/1999

Project: Construct two-story rear addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a two-story addition on the rear of the building. The existing rear façade is not original; it has been greatly altered. The rear addition would be constructed over an existing one-story wing of the building. The proposed work would involve the partial demolition of the existing rear façade. The addition would extend out to the rear face of a non-historic stair tower. The addition would be finished in stucco and have large multiple-light fenestration. The massing of the existing dormer on the rear slope of the roof would not be altered; however, a French door with railing would be installed in an existing opening. Two windows in the non-historic stair-tower would be replaced with double-hung units.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Owners Joseph Romano and Mary Beth Gallo and architect Van Potteiger represented the application.

Mr. Potteiger displayed photographs elucidating his proposal to move the rear façade to the plane of the existing rear stair tower, creating more space on the second and third floors. He

stated that he would not undertake any work to the S. 3rd Street façade. He acknowledged that the project would require zoning variances. Mr. Thomas reminded the applicants that the Commission's and Zoning Board's processes are independent.

Bernice Hamel, a representative of the Society Hill Civic Association, remarked that the Commission's staff should have referred the applicants to her association's zoning committee before proceeding with the Commission's review of this proposal. She stated that her association was troubled to discover it on the Committee's agenda without any notification. Ms. Hamel requested that the Committee to table the proposal to allow her association an opportunity to review the plans. Mr. Danta informed Ms. Hamel that the Committee does not have the authority to table the application; it formulates a non-binding recommendation to the Commission. He also observed that the Commission informed the civic association of the review through its notice to interested parties. The Commission's staff always suggests that applicants consult with their civic associations, but it cannot compel applicants to present proposals to civic associations. He also observed that the Commission considers input from all interested parties. Ms. Hamel requested that the Committee not consider the application. Mr. Danta responded that only the applicant can postpone the process at this stage. Mr. Romano asked the Committee to proceed with his review. Mr. Romano reported on his commitment to the neighborhood. He added that the rear of his house has been significantly altered and retains no historic features. Mr. Thomas counseled that it would be prudent for the applicants to discuss their plans with the civic association, especially if they will be seeking zoning variances. Ms. Gallo stated that they would consult with the association before the Commission meeting. Ms. Hamel again stated that the association should have been contacted prior to any submission.

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

1942 PANAMA STREET

Owner: Nancy Needham

Applicant: Dennis Torres

History: c. 1960

contributing in Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District, designated 2/8/1995

Project: Replace windows and doors

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace all doors and windows in the building at 1942 Panama Street. The building, which is listed as Contributing in the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District, retains its original metal windows and doors. The narrow window units along the front and side facades would be replaced with units that swing and tilt. The sliders on the second, third, and fourth floors would be replaced with clad sliders to fit within the existing openings. The existing three-part patio door system with transom would be replaced with a four-part French door and side light system without transom. The patio door is minimally visible from 20th Street over a garden wall. The new clad units would be in grey color.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Committee. Nancy Needham, the owner, represented the application.

Ms. Needham explained that the windows are deteriorating. Water is infiltrating around them, damaging the interior. She noted her preference for French doors in place of the sliders at the rear.

Mr. Levy asked about the proposed materials. Mr. Danta explained that the proposed windows are wood clad units; the originals are aluminum. The new would have wider members.

Mr. Levy asked why the proposed rear doors are divided into four units; the extant doors are tripartite. Ms. Needham explained that the change to French doors from sliding doors requires different divisions. Mr. Levy noted that the new doors would not align with the windows above. Ms. Needham explained that no one ever views the rear in a way that allows a comparison of the upper and lower floors. Mr. Levy observed that the applicant does not propose to replicate the transoms above the doors.

Ms. Pentz remarked that the application does not propose any changes to openings, only to windows within openings. Ms. Needham stated that the extant windows are original, but have been altered. Ms. Pentz opined that the proposed changes would be reversible.

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

Mr. Thomas excused himself from the meeting.

9554 BUSTLETON AVENUE

Owner: Lifeway Baptist Church

Applicant: Benjamin Mishin

History: Constructed in late 1880s

Project: Roof alterations and tower legalization/modification

OVERVIEW: This project proposes to remove the existing slate roof, deteriorated copper ridges, valleys, and aluminum fascia, deteriorated portions of crown moulding, gutters, and downspouts. The roof would be replaced with asphalt shingles that ostensibly resemble the original slate. However, the asphalt shingle sample and drawing provided do not show the appropriate octagonal shapes. The copper ridges and valleys would be replaced with new copper to match existing. The crown moulding, now covered by aluminum fascia, would be replaced with a Fypon material with dentils. However, the sample provided is very different from the original moulding.

The church's steeple was altered after designation without a permit by the previous owners. The applicant proposes to rebuild portions of the steeple. The vinyl siding would be removed. The double-arched windows would be reopened. The paneled pilasters would be rebuilt. The denticulated base would be reconstructed. However, the rebuilt steeple as documented in the submitted drawing would be a poor facsimile of the historic steeple.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 6, and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell explained that the Committee lacked a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum. Ms. Sell presented the proposal to the Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. Levy stated that the architectural drawings lacked accuracy and important details. He noted that the proposed roofing and steeple alterations were not appropriate recreations of the historic features. He asserted that the application should be deemed incomplete. Ms. Pentz agreed.

RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial owing to incompleteness.

209 CUTHBERT STREET

Owner: 805 Capital Group

Applicant: Richard Thom

History: c. 1870, Designated 1984, Contributing to Old City Historic District

Project: Door legalization and roof deck

OVERVIEW: This project proposes the legalization of the removal of wood and glass double-leaf doors and their replacement with flush metal doors. The wood and glass doors were not historic, but were installed as part of rehabilitation project in 1982. Moreover, the opening is not historic. It was widened significantly, probably in 1982. Originally, it was narrow and open, like the fire stair openings above it.

This project also proposes the reconfiguration of a roof deck that was previously approved. The deck would be constructed on the back portion of the building. It has been redesigned to avoid visibility from surrounding streets, but it will remain minimally visible from some public locations.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Legalization of the door and approval of the deck, provided a mock-up demonstrates that it would be inconspicuous, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell explained that the Committee lacked a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum. Ms. Sell presented the proposal. Architect Richard Thom represented the application.

Mr. Thom stated that his client installed the metal doors for security reasons. Mr. Thom noted that he was not involved in the installation and, after discovering it, had informed his client that he must submit a legalization application to the Commission. Mr. Baron stated that he examined the brickwork at the door and found that the doorway was much narrower historically. He stated that he was not opposed to the flush metal doors because they are on a side façade and because it is inherently impossible to install historic doors in a non-historic opening. The Committee members agreed.

Mr. Thom explained that he had erected a mock-up of the deck and photographed it from every possible angle. He submitted numerous photographs documenting the mock-up. The photographs revealed that the deck is minimally visible from a few locations, but only at great distances. He explained that he had shifted the locations of the railings to minimize and, in many cases, eliminate views of them. He noted that construction on the vacant lot at 218 Arch Street would further reduce its visibility. Mr. Thom stated that he originally proposed one large deck, which was approved, but he has since divided it into two smaller decks. The Committee members thanked Mr. Thom for his thorough and illuminating submission. They noted that the railing would be visible from a few spots on the public right-of-way, but concluded that it would be inconspicuous and therefore meet the Standards.

RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend legalization of the door and approval of the deck, pursuant to Standards 3 and 9.

2041 APPLETREE STREET

Owner/Applicant: Mitchell Harding

History: c. 1850s, designated 4/28/1970

Project: Roof Deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a roof deck on the main roof of the rowhouse. A similar proposal for this property was presented to the Architectural Committee in January. At that time, the Committee agreed that the deck itself satisfied the Standards, owing to its complete lack of visibility from the public right-of-way, but urged the applicant to withdraw and resubmit a proposal with a more appropriate stair. The original stair design included a very large and bulky multi-story stair tower. This application proposes a much smaller spiral stair to access the roof deck from a third-story rear door, which would be cut down from a window. The Commission approved a nearly identical deck and stair proposal for 2033 Appletree Street.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to the Historical Commission's approval of the deck at 2033 Appletree Street.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote explained that the Committee lacked a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum. Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. Owner Mitchell Harding represented the application.

Mr. Harding stated that he has implemented the earlier recommendation of the Architectural Committee and substituted a spiral staircase for the larger, bulkier staircase with supporting structure.

RECOMMENDATION: The members of the Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to the Historical Commission's approval of the deck at 2033 Appletree Street.

1605, 1607, 1609 WALLACE STREET

Owner: Spring Garden Community Development Corporation

Applicant: John Loonstyn

History: Vacant lot in Spring Garden Historic District

Project: Review and Comment: Construct three townhouses

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct three three-story multi-unit townhouses on three adjacent vacant lots in the Spring Garden Historic District. The Commission's jurisdiction is limited to review and comment.

STAFF COMMENT: The staff comments that the proposed buildings are compatible with the historic district, but the proposed nine-over-nine and six-over-six windows should be replaced with two-over-two windows, which are more appropriate to the Italianate neighborhood.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote explained that the Committee lacked a quorum. No one objected to proceeding without a quorum. Ms. Cote presented the proposal to the Committee. John Loonstyn, the developer, represented the application.

Mr. Loonstyn presented revised architectural drawings showing the removal of the stone door surrounds and the replacement of the nine-over-nine and six-over-six windows with two-over-two windows. The Committee members noted that the stone door surrounds had been removed from the drawings, but the annotations for them had not.

COMMENT: The members of the Architectural Committee commented that the buildings as documented in the revised plans are appropriate for the historic district.

ADJOURNMENT: The members of the Architectural Committee adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

Standard 1: A property will be used as it was historically or given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces, and spatial relationships.

Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinct materials or alterations of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

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

Standard 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.