

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

**TUESDAY, 25 AUGUST 2009
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

David Amburn, Chair
John Cluver
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

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

ALSO PRESENT

Frank Rapisarda, Tackett & Company, Architects
Ed Fink, Fink & Stange
Joe Domash
Dan Grossman
Darwin Beauvais, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzberg & Ellers LLP
Tina Geary, Friday Architects
Ken Lowther

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Amburn called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m. Ms. Gutterman and Pentz and Messrs. Cluver, Evans, and McCoubrey joined him.

22-34 AND 36-38 N. 2ND STREET

Owner: Church Wardens of Christ Church and City of Philadelphia
Applicant: Daniela Holt Voith, Voith & Mactavish Architects
History: 1727-1744; landscaping and fence, c. 1925
Significant to Old City Historic District, 12/12/2003
Project: Install gate, low wall, paving and benches, create handicap accessibility

OVERVIEW: This application proposes alterations and additions to two lots making up the yard of Christ Church. The southern lot was historically a cemetery. In the nineteenth century, an addition to the church was constructed at the western end of the lot; the addition was demolished in the mid twentieth century. Two buildings stood on the northern lot; they were demolished in the mid twentieth century and the lot was added to the church yard. Most of the proposed work would occur on the northern lot. The proposed work includes: resetting brick pathways; installing the gateway in the wall to create a passage to the church's Community House on the west side of American Street; constructing a new low wall and circular benches;

adding a ramp to the church building; and adding lighting. The walls and walks that would be altered date to the early twentieth century, not the eighteenth century. No graves would be impacted.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Daniela Holt Voith represented the application.

Ms. Voith explained that this project is the second phase of a two-phase project. The Commission approved the first phase, which included the construction of a new entrance at the church's Community House, which stands to the west across American Street from the site in question. As part of that construction, the Commission approved the relocation of a gateway from the west side to the east side of American Street. The current proposal includes the reinstallation of the gateway. She presented a rendering showing the placements of the gateway.

Mr. Baron asked Ms. Voith to explain the accessibility ramp. Ms. Voith answered that the design shown in the application has been revised. She presented drawings of the revised ramp design. She explained that the new design proposes a sloped straight path that will accommodate all pedestrian traffic, regardless of any physical restrictions. She stated that it is important to the church to create a pathway that allows all parishioners to walk together. Mr. Baron asked if the doorway of the church would be altered to meet ADA requirements. Ms. Voith stated that it would not need alteration. She added that the door had been altered many years ago and would meet the current needs without additional alteration. Ms. Voith explained that the northern lot is currently owned by the Fairmount Park Commission, but will be transferred to the church. The church has the Commission's authorization to apply for the permit and undertake the construction.

Ms. Gutterman asked if enough old brick was available to complete the new paths. Ms. Voith stated that they would use a combination of old and new brick; the new brick would match the old. Ms. Voith conceded that her team is still working out some grading details. Ms. Gutterman asked about the footings for the relocated gate. Ms. Voith stated that the footings will be installed in a way that avoids disrupting the existing wall and other features. She stated that some of the construction details are still under development. Ms. Gutterman noted that the staff should review the details carefully. Mr. Amburn stated that he approved of the project. Mr. McCoubrey asked if the site will remain open to the public. Ms. Voith stated that it would. She added that a new exhibit space will be created inside the newly configured entrance and the yard and gallery will be used to support a new public outreach program.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

2043 WALNUT STREET

Owner: Robert Morris

Applicant: Martin Jay Tackett

History: c. 1855, Contributing to Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Legalize façade alterations facing Walnut and Moravian Streets

OVERVIEW: The staff approved a proposal to rehabilitate this rowhouse into condominiums in 2004. The proposal included restoring the facades with new windows and doors. The proposal also included removing a non-historic brick veneer from the Walnut Street façade and installing new brown stucco features to replicate the historic facade. Applications for this restoration and the restorations of two adjacent houses under separate ownership were approved at the same time. Although the two other houses were successfully restored, this house, which was sold to a new owner, was rehabilitated at variance with the approved plans. Violations were issued.

The non-compliant work included removing historic windows and replacing them with vinyl windows. On the front façade, the vinyl windows have sandwiched muntins. The basement windows, which should be wood casements, were replaced with aluminum sliding units. Although the brick veneer was removed, the façade was not restored according to the approved plans. The details at the door and window surrounds, the lintels and sills, and the beltcourse are greatly simplified and squared off. The doorway was replaced with an inappropriate door and surround. New non-historic flagstone treads were installed on the stoop.

The rear of the property faces Moravian Street, a service alley with a few rowhouses. On the rear, historic windows were removed and concrete lintels installed. Some window opening sizes were altered. Wood windows, which were historically a mix of 4-over-4 and 6-over-6 windows in plank frames, were replaced with vinyl windows in thin frames. Some window openings were converted to doors. The first floor rear was stuccoed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Frank Rapisardo and property owner Robert Morris represented the application.

Mr. Evans observed that applicants seeking legalization of alterations undertaken without a permit or in excess of a permit typically propose a compromise. He noted that this applicant had not proposed a compromise of any sort. He therefore suggested adopting the staff's recommendation and recommending denial of the application. Mr. Amburn agreed.

Mr. Morris disputed Mr. Baron's claims about the extent of the illegal work and claimed that there are only two violations on the property, one for the rear windows and a second for the front façade masonry. He asked why Mr. Baron was raising issues about other work that may be in violation when the application proposes the legalization of the rear windows and front masonry only. He stated that he only has to "deal with" the two matters addressed in the ext of the violations, the rear windows and the front façade masonry. Mr. Morris stated that Mr. Baron had failed to consider the condition of the building at the start of the rehabilitation project. The building had no rear windows and was in "condemned condition." An earlier developer "messed up the project." There were several fires. He stated that his contractor undertook emergency masonry repairs to try to preserve the façade. Mr. Morris explained that he is now in litigation with the contractor because the contractor was required to obtain all requisite Historical Commission approvals, which he did not. He said that there are conflicting accounts of a conversation between the contractor and Mr. Baron. The contractor claims Mr. Baron gave a

verbal approval to the contractor's work. Mr. Baron disputes that claim. Mr. Morris stated that he believes Mr. Baron's account in which no verbal approval was given. Mr. Morris stated that the rehabilitation began in 2005 and was completed in July 2007. He reported that, in December 2006, he received a violation asserting that the rear windows did not have the Commission's approval and giving him 35 days to correct problem. At this time, he spoke to the inspector from the Department of Licenses & Inspections, who stated that there was no violation. He reported that the building is now fully occupied. It would be a burden to remove the tenants to undertake the corrections. He reiterated that he is applying to legalize the rear windows and the front masonry only. He claimed that, because he has not received other violations, the remainder of the building cannot be in violation.

Mr. Baron stated that the violations include all of the windows. Mr. Morris refuted this claim, contending that the violation only cited the rear windows. Mr. Baron stated that all the windows have been changed. He stated that, even if there is no violation for the front windows, there is no permit for the front windows. If there is no permit, then the front windows are in violation, even if the Department has not yet issued a violation for them. The application drawings depict the new vinyl windows in the front façade; therefore, even if they are not called out on the application form, Mr. Morris has applied for an approval or legalization them because they are on the application drawings. Mr. Morris stated that he is not requesting legalization of the front windows because the Department has not issued a violation for them. Mr. Amburn stated that they may be in violation, even if a violation notice has not yet been issued. Mr. Morris stated that the front windows were replaced with a permit. He claimed that it is too late for the Commission to tell him that the windows he installed are not in compliance with the approved drawings. Mr. Baron countered that the approved drawings did not specify vinyl windows; the specified wood windows with particular details. Mr. Morris responded that he was not notified since the completion of the project that the front windows were not in compliance. Mr. Morris again claimed that he can only be held responsible for the non-compliant work noted in the violation citations. Mr. Baron reminded Mr. Morris that they had discussed the window problem during a site visit. Mr. Baron's stated that he believes that the violations cover all the windows. If they do not, violations for the front windows will be requested through the Department. Mr. Morris asserted that the Department would be barred by *laches* from issuing violations. Mr. Baron contended again that the executed work does not comply with the approved drawings. Mr. Morris stated that, although Mr. Baron may have requested additional violations, the Department never issued them.

Mr. Amburn clarified, stating that Mr. Morris was asking the Commission legalize the existing conditions that do not comply with the original permit. Whether violations are in place for all of the existing conditions is not relevant to the legalization question. Mr. Amburn stated that, with the submitted drawings, the applicant is asking to legalize everything that is out of compliance with the permit. Mr. Morris again asserted that the Commission cannot request that the Department issue a violation for work that was done two years ago. Mr. McCoubrey informed Mr. Morris that the property owner has the responsibility to ensure that the construction complies with the permit. Ms. Pentz agreed and stated that the Committee should recommend denial. Mr. Amburn likewise agreed that the Committee should not recommend legalization. Mr. Morris stated that there are two violations. He asked the Committee to decide which violation is more significant and he would consider correcting it. Mr. Amburn stated that the building is out of compliance in many ways with the permit that was issued.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 2, 5, 6, 9, and 10.

2000 N. BROAD STREET

Owner: Dan Grossman & Joe Domosh

Applicant: Sandra Tarcov

History: 1895, Willis Hale, architect, for John Stafford

Individually Designated: 4/30/1986

Project: Construct three-story multi-family dwelling

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a three-story multi-family building on the west portion of the property at 2000 N. Broad Street. A large three-story mansion designed by famed Philadelphia architect Willis Hale stands at the east end of the lot. A carriage house for the mansion, also designed by Hale, stood at the west end of the lot, where the applicants now propose the new construction. The carriage house was neglected and fell into ruin by the late 1980s. The Philadelphia Historical Commission approved its demolition in November 1993. The fraternity that owned the property at the time of the demolition does not own it today. The new owner has undertaken a careful rehabilitation and restoration of the property. Its efforts are ongoing.

The proposed addition is not of a historicist design, yet it pays homage to the former carriage house and the historic mansion. The materials are compatible with those of the former carriage house and the mansion itself. The erection of this building at the rear of the lot would once again reestablish the massing and spatial relationship of the mansion to its setting; historically the mansion was not perceived as a stand alone volume on a large open lot. The original relationship between the mansion and its carriage house was appropriate for this densely built environment. The new construction would reestablish this spatial relationship.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Edward Fink and co-owners Dan Grossman and Joe Domosh represented the application.

Mr. Fink introduced a display board of different colored and textured bricks for comparison to a piece of the original carriage house found on the site. He stated other materials would be concrete or limestone. Mr. Danta suggested a cast stone tinted brown to match the coloration of the mansion. He noted that the carriage house was constructed of terracotta and Roman brick. Mr. Danta opined that limestone would not be appropriate.

Mr. Evans suggested that, instead of diving into the details, Mr. Fink should present an overview of the project. Mr. Fink provided an overview of the project to build rental housing for Temple students. He stated that the new building would be based on the original carriage house as well as the mansion, but would be three stories, not two, as was the carriage house.

Mr. Evans asked if the string courses on the carriage house and mansion had aligned. Mr. Fink responded that it was difficult to determine that with certainty, but they did appear to align.

Ms. Gutterman asked Mr. Fink to explain the rooftop features of the proposed building. Mr. Fink explained that the new building would have a five-foot parapet to hide a green roof and, perhaps, solar panels. Mr. McCoubrey and other Committee members contended that the proportions of the parapet were awkward. They suggested revisions.

Mr. Fink explained that he had proposed as narrow a parking gate as the Streets Department would allow. The Committee members suggested that a metal fence with gate would be more appropriate than the masonry wall proposed. They explained to Mr. Fink that it would be difficult to attach a masonry wall to the historic mansion owing to the configuration of the mansion walls.

Mr. Evans asked the applicant if the new building would be faced with Roman brick, like the surviving mansion. Mr. Fink stated that he intended to use standard brick with standard mortar joints, not the butter joints on the historic house. Mr. Danta asserted that color and materials are more important than the shape of the brick.

Mr. Grossman tried to focus the Committee on the reality of the situation at this property. He stated that he was seeking to construct a nice building on what is now a pile of rubble. He stated that it would be a great improvement for the neighborhood. He pointed out that there are financial limitations when working in this neighborhood in North Philadelphia. The units in this building will not command the rents that they might in another neighborhood. He noted that he has already invested more than \$1 million in the mansion. He stated that he is trying to construct a building that will be a benefit to the neighborhood. Mr. Domosh added that the neighborhood has asked them to replace the pile of rubble with a building. Their goal is to improve the site and neighborhood.

Mr. Cluver stated that the basic proposal was sound, but he asserted that there were many aspects of the proposed materials and details that needed significant refinement. He suggested that the design should be more harmonious with the historic building. Ms. Gutterman added that there is a need for more information before the Committee can make a final decision. She suggested that the rear of the mansion should be drawn to scale on the architectural elevation drawings to allow the Commission to gauge the appropriateness of the height and massing of the new building. Mr. Evans advised the applicant that he should not create a caricature of the former carriage house, but should instead focus on the massing and coloration of the new construction. Mr. McCoubrey agreed, stating that the materials choices and the details should be refined.

Mr. Grossman asked the Committee how he should proceed. Mr. Evans replied that the Committee cannot merely pick architectural features off a menu for the applicants to assemble. He suggested that the architect should refine the design, proposing a building that is compatible with but not a copy of the historic mansion. Mr. Amburn stated that the concept is good; the size and scale of the proposed building are appropriate. Mr. Fink formally requested that the Commission convert his application to an application for review in concept, not for final approval. The Committee agreed that that conversion was appropriate in this instance.

Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the architect consider how the fence or wall will intersect with the watertable on the mansion. Ms. Gutterman suggested that he raise the basement windows for better proportions.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval in concept.

533 N. 22ND STREET

Owner: Applicant: Helena Grady & Joel Maruchek

History: c. 1865

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

Project: Create off-street parking

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to create off-street parking along the rear yard of this corner mixed use property. This rear yard fronts onto Brandywine Street, an otherwise residential street lined with front facades. The Historical Commission reviewed and approved an application for a deck in September 2002. The deck was never constructed. The applicant now proposes to install a deck of the same dimensions on the same location as previously approved. The current proposal also proposes to create a parking area, which would require a curb cut. The applicant proposes to enclose this parking area with a new stained wood gate and fence. The sidewalk along this portion of the property is brick. In addition, the applicant proposes to install a small awning over the entire length of the rear elevation.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the brick pavers are salvaged and reset on the driveway, and provided that the awning is shortened to cover the doorway only, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the proposal to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Joel Maruchek represented the application.

Mr. Cluver inquired whether the proposed deck would attach to the neighboring house. The applicant answered that it would not. He also noted that it would not block the light or air to the neighboring houses.

The Committee members commented that the proposed awning was not appropriate. The applicant agreed to reduce the size of the awning to the width of the door or to eliminate it altogether. The Committee asked if the applicant would reuse the brick from the sidewalk, as the staff had recommended. He stated that that was his intention.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the brick pavers are salvaged and reset on the driveway, and provided that the awning is shortened to cover the doorway only, pursuant to Standard 9.

332 S. 24TH STREET

Owner: Judith A. Wicks

Applicant: Arlene Matzkin

History: c. 1830, façade replaced in 1960

Designated: Contributing to the Rittenhouse Fittler Residential Historic District, 2/8/1995

Project: Replace windows and door, alter window openings, add balcony

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to alter the façade of the rowhouse at 332 S. 24th Street. The applicant proposes to enlarge the ground-floor windows from two double-hung windows to a ganged row of three double-hung windows. The entry door would be replaced by a single-leaf multi-light door. At the second floor, the applicant proposes to lengthen the window openings for doors; the new single-leaf, multi-light doors would open onto a balcony. The balcony would protrude from the façade by two feet. The windows would be replaced with clad units that would replicate the appearance of historic windows.

The property was constructed in the 1830s as part of the early development along the east side of the Schuylkill River banks. However, its original façade was replaced with slightly altered masonry openings in the 1960s. The property at 334 S. 24th Street was constructed at the same time and, although it too has been slightly altered, it retains its original masonry openings. The staff opines that the lengthening of the second-floor windows and the installation of a balcony would disrupt the spatial relationship of the façade and the original design intent, which was maintained by the 1960s alteration. In addition, the introduction of ganged windows at the ground-floor would also have a negative effect on the proportions, rhythms, and spatial relationships of the façade. The staff notes, however, that the current ground-floor masonry openings at 332 S. 24th Street are disproportionably smaller than the neighboring single window found at 334 S. 24th Street. The two ground-floor windows in the subject property could be enlarged to create more harmonious proportions. The staff offers this suggestion to the applicant as an alternative to the proposed three windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Tina Geary represented the application.

Ms. Geary stated that the owner wishes to enlarge the first-floor front windows, lengthening them approximately 12" bringing the sill height down to counter height in the kitchen area.

Mr. Cluver agreed that elongating the windows was acceptable because the current window openings are smaller than the historic openings. However, he asserted that the two openings should be maintained, rather than be widened to one large opening for three windows.

Mr. Cluver questioned the proposed balcony. The Committee members suggested shortened, individual balconies at each opening rather than a single balcony running the entire width of the façade. They noted that this façade dates to the 1960s. It is not historic fabric. The Committee suggested that the architect revise the second-floor door design to reduce the width of the stiles. The architect agreed to do so.

The Committee members suggested a revised door design. They asserted that the fully glazed door is not appropriate. The architect offered to redesign it as a wood, multi-lights door with panels below.

The Committee members agreed that the proposed clad windows were appropriate for this building, which has a 1960s façade.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided the proposed fully-glazed door is replaced with a wood, multi-lights door with panels below; the two window openings at the first floor are retained and elongated to correspond to the sill height of the neighboring building to the south; the proposed second-floor balcony is replaced with two balconies that are the widths of the openings; the widths of the stiles of the second-floor doors are reduced; with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

130 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Philadelphia Rittenhouse Developer LP

Applicant: Darwin R. Beauvais, Esq.

History: Newly constructed building in Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District

Project: Add signage

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install internally illuminated signage. The signs would be installed at the storefront windows and the entrance door of the ground-floor commercial unit of this newly constructed building known as 10 Rittenhouse. In 2004, the Commission approved the demolition of the four rowhouses converted for commercial use that stood on the site and the construction of the 400-foot tower with storefronts on 18th and Sansom Streets.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Darwin Beauvais and sign designer Joe Vasta represented the application.

Mr. Beauvais stated this bank will be the anchor for the corner of 18th and Sansom Streets. He introduced photographs of the corner showing the streetscape. He provided a short history of the bank and its recent merger. He noted that this would be the flagship branch. He added that the zoning and Arts Commission approvals have been obtained. Mr. Beauvais presented a copy of the original storefront design that was approved by the Commission in 2004.

Mr. Cluver noted that the previously approved storefront design included storefront windows and doors with a masonry base that are unlike the storefronts depicted in the sign drawings with the current application. He noted that the storefronts shown in the sign drawings are butt-glazed. The approved storefronts were more traditional with visible metal frames. He asked the applicants if they were proposing to replace the storefronts with new butt-glazed storefronts. Mr. Beauvais replied that no storefronts have been installed yet in this new building. He submitted a current photograph showing that the storefront areas in the new building are still open and under construction. The photograph included a cover sheet explained that Metro Bank was proposing to change the storefronts. Mr. Beauvais stated that the bank is proposing to change the design from the previously approved storefronts to the design shown in the sign drawings. Mr. Danta stated that this application initially proposed signage only. No mention was made of the intent to change the storefronts until this meeting. The Committee members observed that the signage design is dependent on the storefront design. The drawings of the proposed signage do not indicate any changes to the storefronts, even though they appear to show storefronts that differ from those presented to the Commission during the reviews of the new building. Several members asserted that the butt-glazed storefronts would not be appropriate to this new, but traditionally-styled building. They asked Mr. Danta to confirm which storefront design had been approved by the Commission. Mr. Danta noted that the project had undergone many revisions, owing to its size and complexity. He stated that he could not confirm the approved storefront design without conducting some research. The Committee members also asked the staff to determine whether the property owner had authorized the application. The Committee members informed the applicants that the Commission has a responsibility to protect the historic district, even if the building is brand new. They suggested that the applicant present complete documentation of any proposed storefront revisions to the Commission. They noted that the Commission may require the Architectural Committee to review the storefront design before acting on the application.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the signage if the revised storefront was previously approved, but denial owing to incompleteness if the revised storefront was not previously approved.

9554 BUSTLETON AVENUE

Owner: Lifeway Baptist Church

Applicant: Vasiliy Kolesnik

History: constructed in late 1880s

Project: Construct rear addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct a second-story addition to a modern, rear, one-story building. The addition would be clad in stucco and slate-line asphalt shingles. The existing structure is set back from the historic church and the connection will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. No one represented the application.

Mr. Evans noted that the plans may not meet building codes owing to the lack of an elevator and a secondary means of egress. He noted that these matters were outside the Commission's purview, but he asserted that the Commission should not spend time reviewing plans that would be automatically rejected by the Department of Licenses & Inspections. Mr. Evans also contended that the application lacked significant details and should therefore be rejected. Ms. Gutterman and Pentz expressed the same concerns and added that the application left many questions unanswered owing to a lack of details. They contended that a representative of the application should have attended the meeting to answer their many questions. Mr. Cluver stated that the project could be successful, but he would need to review more information regarding the design such as connection details between new and old, materials, and other aspects of the design. The staff stated that it had recommended approval because the connection between new and old is at the rear, facing a parking lot, and the building at the rear, on which the addition would be constructed, has no historical significance.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, owing to incompleteness.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

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.