

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

**TUESDAY, 22 SEPTEMBER 2009
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

David Amburn, Chair
John Cluver
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey

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

Ken Lowther, Metro Bank
Ed Fink, Fink and Stange Architects
Claire Donato, MBTA
Brian Meneghin, RMJM
Hope Zoss, Smith Playground
McKenzie Myers, Hunt Engineering
Ashly Nelson, Thomas Cole Group
John Nelson, Thomas Cole Group
Martin Rosenblum, MJRA
Dan Grossman, IAP
Joe Domash, IAP
Jim Gatch, Gatch Group
Jerry Jarosinski, Amburn/Jarosinski Architects
Allen Rubin, Spring Garden Civic Association
Tim Kerner, Terra Studio

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Amburn called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Ms. Gutterman and Messrs. Cluver and McCoubrey joined him.

130 S. 18TH STREET

Owner: Philadelphia Rittenhouse Developer LP

Applicant: Darwin R. Beauvais

History: Newly constructed building in Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District

Project: Add signage

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install a butt-glazed storefront system and internally illuminated signage in a newly constructed building. The ground-floor commercial space at the corner of 18th and Sansom Streets will house a bank. The Commission approved a slightly different storefront design in October 2007. The previously approved storefront windows would have had mullions; the proposed storefront would be butt-glazed. The signage would be internally illuminated with plastic faces and stainless steel frames.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Darwin Beauvais and designer Timothy Hogan represented the application.

Mr. Danta explained that the staff had recommended approval because the building is new, not historic, and the revision to the storefront from the previously approved design would not have an adverse impact on the district or streetscape. He added that the granite storefront base, which was part of the approved design, would now be retained, not jettisoned. He also noted that the storefront glazing would have the same proportions as the approved design, albeit without the mullions.

Mr. Beauvais stated that the application had been slightly revised since the application reviewed by the Committee last month. He noted that that application had been withdrawn before the Commission meeting. He stated that the granite storefront base, which appears in the Commission-approved storefront design, would be retained. He added that the storefront windows would retain the approved proportions, but not the mullions. Mr. Hogan stated that the proposed storefront is consistent with the approved storefront proportioning. Mr. Beauvais added that they have already obtained the requisite approvals from other city agencies such as Zoning and the Art Commission.

Mr. Cluver asked the applicants to explain the location of the face of the sign in relation to the storefront glass, transom bar, and masonry structure. Mr. Hagan stated that the sign face would be behind the outer plane of the masonry structure. The Committee members asked for more details. Mr. Hogan explained that the sign would attach to the transom bar and masonry storefront structure. The Committee members pressed the applicants for the location of the face of the sign in relation to the outer plane of the glass. Mr. Beauvais stated that the signage would enliven the corner of 18th and Sansom Streets. The Committee members again asked the applicants to explain how the sign was attached to the storefront and to define how much the sign projected beyond the face of the glass. Mr. Hogan stated that it may project as much as 8 inches, but the construction details were unclear. Ken Lauther of Metro Bank stepped forward from the audience and stated that his application team would provide the requisite details. Mr. Farnham noted that this project had already undergone one aborted review. He asked the Committee members if they could stipulate an acceptable projection of the sign beyond the storefront glass to allow this project to move forward. Messrs. Cluver and McCoubrey stated that the best solution would be a sign face that was flush with the storefront glass. However, they agreed that a projection of 2 inches beyond the face of the glass and no projection beyond

the face of the transom bar would be acceptable. Mr. Lauther stated that his design team would meet this requirement.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the application, provided the signage does not project more than 2 inches beyond the face of the glass and not at all beyond the face of the transom bars, with the staff to review details.

2000 N. BROAD STREET

Owner: Dan Grossman & Joe Domosh

Applicant: Sandra Tarcov

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

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 rear portion of this lot. The lot contains a large three-story mansion designed by famed Philadelphia architect Willis Gaylord Hale. The applicant submitted an application in concept last month, which was approved by the Commission. The applicant now proposes final approval.

The area of the lot where the applicant proposes the new construction was once occupied by the carriage house to the mansion, also designed by Hale. 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, which owned the property at the time of the demolition, does not own it today. The new owner is undertaking a careful rehabilitation and restoration of the property. Its efforts are ongoing.

The revised addition proposes a building that pays homage to the lost carriage house and the historic mansion without being overly historicist. The materials are compatible with those of the former carriage house and the mansion itself. The massing and proportions of the addition have been refined and the rooftop penthouse has been entirely eliminated. The erection of this building at the rear of the lot would once again reestablish the historical massing and spatial relationships of the mansion to its setting.

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 developers Dan Grossman and Joe Domosh represented the application.

Mr. Grossman stated that they have responded to the previous recommendations of the Architectural Committee. They have revised the design, proportions, materials, and details. They eliminated the penthouse. The Committee members acknowledged the improvements to the design including the reduction of the height of the parapet and changes of materials.

The Committee members requested clarifications on the materials. Mr. Fink explained that the cast stone would be used at the water table. All of the flush trim above the watertable would be stucco on block with an elastomeric coating to match the terra cotta on the mansion. Projecting trim would be a cast material. Mr. Fink explained that the changes in material were based on a cost analysis.

Ms. Gutterman requested a clarification regarding the areas to which the elastomeric coating would be applied. Mr. Fink explained that the elastomeric coating will be used on all trim surfaces above the water table. He noted that the water table would be the only cast material with an integral color. Mr. Fink explained the trim pieces that project would be cast; the trim pieces that would be flush with the façade would be stucco. The stucco would be applied and then scored. Two coats of the elastomeric coating would be applied to the stucco to give it an even color that would replicate the color of the terra cotta. The Committee members suggested a stucco finish with an integrated color. Mr. Fink explained that the elastomeric would provide a more consistent color throughout. Mr. Cluver questioned the sheen and reflective nature of the elastomeric coating. Mr. Fink passed around several small samples of elastomeric coatings on stucco of various colors to the Committee members.

Ms. Gutterman contended that the elastomeric coating is not appropriate for the project; it would look substandard. She suggested to the applicant that they consider alternative materials. She suggested using all cast trim and no elastomeric coatings. She claimed that the cast trim would have a lower maintenance cost than the coated trim, which would require periodic recoating. Mr. McCoubrey suggested substituting the proposed coated stucco in the large central area with the brick proposed for elsewhere on the facade. Mr. Danta asked the Committee to come to a resolution on the materials question. The Committee members agreed that the trim materials proposed as stucco with an elastomeric coating should be changed to a color-integral cast material. The applicants again explained that the economics of this project on N. Broad Street would not support the use of an expensive cast material. They noted that they had priced real brownstone, which was exceedingly expensive.

Mr. Cluver pointed out that the Department of Licenses and Inspections may object to the design of the front stoop, which may not meet the building code. He observed that the proposed stoop design is very successful. If the Department requires a revision to its design, the staff should ensure that the revised design is appropriate. He asserted that the basement window lintels should better align with the bond pattern of the watertable. Mr. Fink explained that the size of the windows was established by the egress requirements. Mr. Cluver suggested that they change the bond pattern, not the windows.

Mr. Cluver asked about the gate. Mr. Fink stated that it would be a telescoping estate-type gate to match the proposed fence.

Mr. Cluver asked about the proposed windows. Mr. Fink explained that they would be Anderson or Jeldwen windows. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the basement windows should be set back into the openings, not in the plane of the façade, to give the appearance of a solid masonry base. Mr. Fink stated that he could set them back.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the trim labeled as terra cotta on the architectural drawings is a color-integral cast material, not stucco with an elastomeric coating, with the staff to review the details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

1518 PINE STREET

Owner/Applicant: Martin J. Rosenblum

History: 1849; Significant to Rittenhouse Fittler Residential Historic District

Project: Demolish garage, add fences and gates

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to demolish a rear, one-story, detached, brick, one-car garage and reduce the east elevation of the garage to six feet in order to create a continuous stucco wall on the property line. The plan indicates that a series of wood and metal fences and gates are proposed for the rear yard. However, no details of the proposed fencing are provided.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Commission. Architect and property owner Martin Rosenblum represented the application.

Mr. Rosenblum noted that, at the request of the neighbor, the wall on the property line will be brick, not stucco as the drawings now stipulate. He stated that the wall will not be constructed, but will be a remnant of the garage left in place. He will cut the garage wall on the property line down to the height of the proposed perimeter wall. Mr. Amburn agreed that the wall should not be stuccoed. Mr. Rosenblum stated that he will install two four-by-four steel columns on his property along the wall to buttress it. He also plans to retain the returns, small sections of the front and rear walls of the garage, to support the side wall on the property line.

Mr. McCoubrey asked about the fences and gates shown on the plan. Mr. Rosenblum clarified that although the plan shows new fences and gates, they are currently cost prohibitive and are not part of this application. He stated that he plans to install a plain board fence between the parking and the house. He stated that he will submit a new application for the other fences and gates when he has the funding for the improvements.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of the demolition of the garage, retention of the brick wall with returns, addition of the structural columns to the wall, and the installation of the simple board fence, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standard 9.

1550 N. 33RD STREET, SMITH MEMORIAL PLAYGROUND

Owner: Hope Zoss, Executive Director

Applicant: Brian C. Meneghin, CLA

History: 1899, James Windrim, architect

Project: Relocate parking, landscape grounds

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the relocation of parking, installation and reconfiguration of landscaping, and the reconstruction of the hexagonal pavilion previously dismantled in Phase I of the Smith Memorial Playground rehabilitation. The Commission reviewed and approved Phase I, II, and III in 2004, 2006, and 2007 respectively. Much of the work proposed in this application, including the parking reconfiguration and removal of the pool, was approved in the earlier applications.

This application proposes to relocate the existing parking lot and access drives closer to Reservoir Drive. Creation of a landscaped oval lawn and various landscaping features including trees and shrubbery, perimeter fencing, lighting, and entry gate are also proposed for the Picnic

Lawn. The proposed entry gate is a hinged metal picket mounted on two brick piers with cast stone caps. Installation of a water play feature, consisting of a dry deck fountain, seat walls, and benches, is proposed within the Picnic Lawn, just northeast of the Playhouse. Reconstruction of the hexagonal pavilion is proposed on or near its original location southwest of the passive and active play areas.

Two play areas proposed for the southern portion of the property have been previously reviewed and approved in earlier phases of the project.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Playground director Hope Zoss, architects Brian Meneghin and Claire Donato, and engineer McKenzie Myers represented the application.

Mr. Meneghin explained that the main aspect of this phase of the project is the relocation of the parking closer to Reservoir Drive. The parking lot in front of the playhouse would be removed and a new parking lot would be constructed at the street. The dilapidated, non-historic pool would be removed and a new service drive and bus parking lot would be added to the north. The oval area in front of the playhouse would be landscaped as a lawn with walks. Bioswales with educational features would be added on either side of the lawn. Black, lightweight, six-foot perimeter fencing would be added. The perimeter fencing would have a masonry base at the top of the oval, at the edge of the parking lot. A pavilion, which was dismantled with the Commission's approval in an earlier phase, would be reconstructed at the edge of the oval. A fountain, a dry-deck interactive play area with colored paving and interactive jets, would be installed on the oval. It would have a 16-inch seat wall around it. To create sloped ADA walks from the oval to the playhouse, the steps of the house would be moved forward toward the oval to allow the walks to run behind them. Because they are sloped walks rather than ramps, they would not need railings. The historic steps and masonry landing would be reused.

Ms. Gutterman asked the staff to enumerate the aspects of the plan that the Commission has already approved during reviews of earlier phases of the project. Ms. Sell noted that the approved site plan for this area of the playground was included in the Committee's informational packets. Mr. Farnham explained that the demolition of the pool, relocation of the parking, service entrance, reconstructed pavilion, and fencing had all been approved previously, in some instances in slightly different configurations. He stated that the primary new components were the bioswales, dry-deck fountain, shifted steps, and sloped ADA walks.

The Committee members asked about the light fixtures, which will be bronze, and the sidewalks, which will be concrete with aggregate. The Committee members concluded that the project was very well designed and appropriate for the site. They congratulated the applicants on the proposal.

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

2137 ST. JAMES STREET

Owner: Heather and Michael Ascher

Applicant: Tim Kerner

History: 1923 by Spencer Roberts; Significant, Rittenhouse Fidler Residential Historic District

Project: Restore window openings, install aluminum-clad windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the window openings and install aluminum-clad windows at this house in the English Village. The non-historic bay would be removed from the first floor, and the historic configuration of casement windows would be installed, although clad in aluminum. The openings on the second and third floor would be restored, and aluminum-clad double-hung sash windows and casements would be installed respectively. The proposed window frames and brick molds would be clad in aluminum as well.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: The staff has no recommendation as detail drawings of the proposed casement windows were not provided. The staff has advised the applicant to provide the requisite drawings and a window sample at the Architectural Committee meeting.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Tim Kerner and owner Michael Ascher represented the application.

Mr. Kerner presented the additional window details to the Committee.

He explained that the windows and the window openings at the front façade of this building were significantly altered before designation. At the first floor, the original windows were removed and a non-historic bay added. At the upper floors, the original windows and sills were removed, the openings reduced in size, and the windows replaced inappropriately. He stated that the original frames had been left in place and stucco smeared over them to create smaller openings. He is proposing to remove the bay and inappropriate aluminum windows, restore the openings, and install aluminum-clad, simulated-divided-light windows that would replicate the appearance of the original windows.

Mr. Kerner introduced a sample of the Marvin window he is hoping to use. He noted that Quaker may also be able to make the same window. He showed samples of the brickmold, muntin, frame, and sill. He explained that his client wants the historic appearance, but not the maintenance of a wood window. Mr. Ascher stated that he now has a wood door and is constantly repainting it. He does not want to have to repaint wood windows.

Ms. Gutterman asked the staff to confirm that the windows were altered before designation. The Committee looked at the designation photograph, which showed the non-historic bay and windows. Ms. Gutterman asked if the alterations were noted in the Rittenhouse Fidler Historic District inventory. Mr. Farnham examined the inventory and replied that it does not include that level of specificity. He stated that, in general, the Rittenhouse Fidler inventory is of very poor quality. Ms. Gutterman asked about the Commission's precedent for approving such applications. Mr. Farnham stated that the Commission has approved a handful of clad, simulated-divided-light windows for historic buildings in the last few years. He stated that the Commission is more concerned with maintaining the exterior historic appearance than requiring traditionally-constructed windows. He noted that the City's concerns regarding energy efficiency and the environment have caused the Commission to expand its notion of appropriateness. He also noted that requiring wood, true-divided-light windows left consumers with few window choices.

Ms. Gutterman stated that the proposed windows were a very good match for the historic windows. She stated that, as long as the staff verifies that the profiles and dimensions of the new windows closely replicate those of the historic windows, she could support the application. She stated that the restoration of the historic window appearance and the reduced maintenance are commendable. Mr. Cluver admired the care taken by the applicant in his research of the historic and replacement windows. He opined that the proposed windows will look as good as the wood windows. Mr. Amburn concurred. They noted that the historic wood windows had already been lost. Mr. McCoubrey disagreed and stated that he would prefer a wood replacement window. Mr. Cluver stated that the new windows should have a black spacer bar. Mr. Kerner replied that Marvin offers that as an option and he would include them.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the windows have black spacer bars, with the staff to review details.

1734 MT VERNON STREET

Owner/Applicant: Monique De Lapenha

History: c. 1859, contributing to the Spring Garden Historic District, 2000

Project: Legalize rear deck

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the legalization as well as alteration to a deck erected at the back of this rowhouse. The deck extends from the rear ell of the property and sits out over a rear bay and the rear yard. It is supported by large concrete columns. It is highly visible from 18th Street. This deck replaced a much smaller deck, which sat entirely on the rear ell of the building. The application also proposes a new railing for the deck.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

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

Mr. Baron introduced photographs of the subject property that depicted the existing conditions. He explained that the inappropriate windows in the front façade have been replaced and the violation for them has been cleared. He stated that this application relates to the rear deck only, which was constructed without a building permit or the Commission's approval and is now in violation. The Committee members agreed that the deck was extremely inappropriate for the historic building and does not meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10 and the Roofs Guideline.

2101 DELANCEY STREET

Owner: David & Ellen Odenath

Applicant: David Amburn

History: c. 1859, altered and extended at rear 1912, Edward Paxon, architect

Designation: Individually Designated, 1/6/1972, Contributing to Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District, 1995

Project: Rear addition/alteration

OVERVIEW: This application proposes enlarging a garage, adding a terrace on the garage, and converting a fourth-floor sunroom to a deck, all at the rear of the building at 2101 Delancey Street, which faces Cypress Street, a service alley. Cypress Street is faced by garages in this block and the rear of this building is a later addition, which has itself been altered. The garage, which is set back from the sidewalk, would be extended out to the sidewalk, like the others on the block, and a terrace would be added on top of the extension. The non-historic sunroom at the fourth-floor rear would be demolished and replaced with an open deck. The character of the rear will be preserved, significant fabric will not be removed, and the consistency of the street wall will be enhanced.

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

DISCUSSION: Owing to his firm's involvement, Mr. Amburn disqualified himself and left the room.

Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Architect Jerry Jarosinski and property owner Ellen Odenath represented the application.

Mr. Baron introduced 1910 and 1922 maps depicting the property, which showed that the rear half of the rear ell had been constructed between those dates. He noted there had been several alterations to the rear over time. He postulated that the beveled corners of the ell post-date 1922 and are not original to the c. 1920 rear ell. Ms. Gutterman questioned the inventory of the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District for a more detailed account of the rear ell and was informed that the inventory's entry for the building is not detailed.

Mr. Cluver asked if the top-floor parapet, where the deck will be created, is tall enough to meet the building code requirements. He asked if a railing would be added to the top of the parapet. Mr. Jarosinski stated that the parapet is four feet tall; no railing will be needed. Mr. Cluver asked if a wall currently exists where the window wall will be installed. Mr. Jarosinski stated that there is no wall there now.

Ms. Gutterman asked Ms. Odenath if she would consider divided lights rather than large sheets of glass for the window wall. She stated that she would. She explained that she installed a window wall with divided lights by the same company in her vacation house and likes it very much. She offered to have her architect revise the design to show divided lights.

Mr. Cluver asked if a railing would be needed at the terrace above the garage. Mr. Jarosinski stated that a railing is proposed. Ms. Odenath explained the strange ceiling heights that resulted from the addition of the garage. She stated that this project would correct that deficiency. Mr. Cluver asked if the window openings would be widened to accommodate the doors to the terrace on the garage. Mr. Jarosinski stated that they would not.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided the window wall at the fourth floor is revised to have divided lights, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 9 and 10.

626 N. 16TH STREET

Owner: James Gatch

Applicant: Troy Nelson

History: Undeveloped site in the Spring Garden Historic District

Project: Construct new house

OVERVIEW: This application proposes the construction of a brick row house on an undeveloped site in the Spring Garden Historic District. The Commission has review-and-comment jurisdiction over the project. The staff comments that the building should be modified to be more in keeping with the character of other row houses in the district. Specifically, the front stoop should project toward the street rather than running along the facade, the proposed parapet should be replaced with a cornice, the keystones, which unrelated to the district stylistically, should be removed from the lintels over the windows, the balconies should be deleted, and the door with fanlight should be replaced. Most doors in the district would feature four panels.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Developers James Gatch and John and Ashly Nelson represented the application.

The applicants explained that they had revised the design since it was submitted for review in response to community concerns. They introduced a revised drawing to the Committee depicting the façade with the keystones, balconies, and the colonial door deleted, and a cornice in place of the parapet. They stated that they would provide a second revised drawing at the Commission meeting to show a stoop turned to the street. They explained that the lintels and sills will be of a cast stone material. They confirmed that the front façade of the building will be in the same plane as those of the neighboring houses.

The drawings show a window well, which will project out from the façade plane into the sidewalk about 36 inches. It will serve as the second means of egress for the basement unit. A grate will swing open from the inside for emergency exit. Mr. Baron noted that owners often place Plexiglas covers over this type of well to prevent debris and water from collecting in them. He suggested that, if such a cover is necessary, perhaps it could be designed to sit under the grate rather than above the sidewalk level.

Mr. Cluver suggested revising the spacing of the windows. It was noted that the door could be a single-leaf door designed to look like a double-leaf door.

The Committee suggested that the cornice have more detail, but not mimic the historic cornices in the area. It should not be the same as the historic cornices, but compatible with them

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE COMMENT: The Architectural Committee voted to comment that the stoop should have the historic configuration, with the steps parallel not perpendicular to the front facade, the cornice should be revised to be more compatible, and an inconspicuous, code compliant window well cover should be considered.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:00 p.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.

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