

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

**TUESDAY, 25 NOVEMBER 2008
COMMISSION CONFERENCE ROOM, ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DAVID AMBURN, CHAIR**

PRESENT

David Amburn, Chair
Shawn Evans
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

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

Leonard Reuter, Assistant City Solicitor

ALSO PRESENT

John Gallery, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Sabra Smith, Preservation Alliance for Greater Philadelphia
Tom Lussenhop
Sam Olshin, Atkin Olshin Schade Architects
David Hollenberg, University of Pennsylvania
Andrew Curtis, Atkin Olshin Schade Architects
Ron Patterson, Esq., Klehr Harrison Harvey Branzberg & Ellers
Ed Harrison
Magali Sarfatti Larson
Mary Goldman
Dan Deritis, Apartments@Penn, Inc.
Mathew Grubel
Guy Laron
Mary Nixon
Terry O'Leary
Frances R. Byers
Charles Larson
Mary Berzinsky
Melani Lamond
Paul Stone, Emerald Window
Jeff Black
Pat Hannigan, GS Architects
Kevin Creighton, Russell Roofing
Dov Leis, Taws
Miles Grosbard, PZS Architects
Eileen Quigley, Esq., Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll

Anthony Miksitz
Dorothy Grosick
Mark D'Alonzo, D'Alonzo Architects
Neil Sklaroff, Esq. Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
George Thomas, Civic Visions

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Amburn called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Ms. Gutterman and Pentz and Mr. McCoubrey joined him. Mr. Evans joined them during the meeting.

400 S. 40TH STREET

Owner: Campus Inn Associates

Applicant: Sam Olshin, AIA

History: 1856, Colonial Revival alterations and additions, c. 1900, additions 1964, 1973
individually designated, 11/1/1973

Project: Restore house, construct 10-story addition

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore an Italianate house and construct a 10-story hotel addition. The design has been revised since it was reviewed by the Commission at its November 2008 meeting.

The building at 400 S. 40th Street was constructed as a large Italianate residence in 1856. The grand house was rehabilitated in the Colonial Revival style in the late nineteenth century by David P. Leas, the co-owner of a Leas & McVitty, a tannery. It was converted into a convalescent home in the middle of the twentieth century and then almost entirely encased in concrete block additions in 1964. A stair tower was added in 1975. The building covers most of the large lot, with asphalt paved drives at the front and rear. It served as a convalescent home for many years, but was eventually closed. The University of Pennsylvania purchased the derelict property in 2003. It is and has been vacant and in very poor condition for several years.

In July 2007, the current applicant petitioned the Commission to rescind the individual designation of the property; he claimed that the building was so altered that the Commission either was unaware of its condition and/or made an error in professional judgment when it was designated. He noted that a large stair tower was added to the building after designation without the Commission's review. The Commission denied the request to rescind the designation and asked the applicant to develop a scheme for his hotel project that would allow for the retention and restoration of the historic house.

In November 2007, the applicant proposed the concept of a hotel development project that conformed to the suggestion offered by the Commission during its July 2007 rescission review. The proposal included the restoration of the historic house and the construction of an 11-story hotel addition linked to the house by a three-story connector. The Commission approved that in-concept application. It considered the construction of the hotel building an acceptable trade-off for the complete restoration of the historic house including the removal of the inappropriate additions. Following its longstanding practice, the Commission limited its review to the compatibility of the hotel building with the site and did not consider the impact of the hotel on the surrounding area. The in-concept approval was initially valid for one year, but has been extended through May 2009.

After receiving the approval in concept, the applicant and his architects devoted one year to developing the design as directed by the Commission. The Architectural Committee reviewed the project at its October 2008 meeting and recommended approval with some revisions. In November 2008, the Commission reviewed the revised project. Despite the approval in concept, the Commission denied the application for final approval. During the review, several interested parties offered testimony that contended that the proposed development would be incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood. Some claimed that the Commission should review the application as if it were located within a “de facto” locally-designated historic district. Others suggested that the Commission should consider the impact on the surrounding area because the property is located within a National Register historic district. However, both assertions are in conflict with the historic preservation ordinance. The Commission designated the site at 400 S. 40th Street individually; it is not in a locally designated historic district. Therefore, the Commission must consider the impact of the proposed work on the site itself only, not the surrounding area. Since the denial at the November 2008 Commission meeting, the Law Department has directed the Commission that it must not consider the impact of proposals for individually designated sites not in historic districts on surrounding areas. Other regulatory agencies, the City Planning Commission and the Zoning Board of Adjustment, are empowered to assess the effects of proposals like this one on surrounding properties; the Historical Commission is not. The Historical Commission cannot hold the owner of an individually designated property not in a district responsible for the effect of alterations to her property on the general surroundings because the Commission’s review at the time of designation addressed the single property only and not any surrounding properties. If a property is designated as part of a district, the Commission would hold public meetings at which the Commission and property owner could discuss the implications of including the property as a component in a larger historic resource. To treat a designated property not in a district as part of a “de facto” historic district could potentially violate a property owner’s due process rights. Moreover, if the Commission were to limit a property owner’s use of an individually-designated property based upon impacts to neighboring properties, that limitation could potentially constitute a taking; if it did, it would be unconstitutional. The Law Department advises in this case that the Commission must limit its review to a determination of whether the proposed alterations and additions are compatible with the subject property, 400 S. 40th Street, under the evaluation criteria set forth in the historic preservation ordinance and Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines.

The project proposed in the current application has been revised since the Commission denied it in November 2008. The revisions include several suggestions offered during the October-November 2008 Committee and Commission reviews. The design of the three-story retail section has been revised to be more compatible with the historic house. The brick cladding on the hotel has been returned to the south façade as suggested. The 40th Street steps at the sidewalk have been centered on the front entrance. The planters have been modified and a replica of the original hairpin fence is now proposed.

The historic house would be rehabilitated as the hotel’s reception area, offices, the breakfast room, and several guest rooms. The house would be restored to its c. 1900 condition; it was significantly altered at that time, when a Colonial Revival front porch replaced the Italianate porch; a grand Palladian window was added to the south façade; and a large addition was added at the rear. The Colonial Revival alterations and additions have achieved their own historic significance and should be preserved. The applicant proposes to demolish the unsympathetic additions and restore or reconstruct the historic elements of the house. The appearance of the house is known from period photographs. The applicant proposes to deviate from a full restoration in one regard. The restored front porch would be enclosed as a dining

area for the hotel guests. However, that deviation is in compliance with the Rehabilitation Standards, which allow reconstructed features to be compatible without being precise replicas.

The majority of the guest rooms as well as some retail space would be located in a 10-story building to be constructed at the southern edge of the property. The height of the 10-story building is mitigated by shorter, transitioning wings at the front and rear. The hotel would be clad in fiber cement panels, Roman brick, and have a fenestration system that incorporates through-wall vertical air control systems, avoiding unsightly projecting units. The new building would link to the old with a narrow connector. The proposed three-story link would require the removal of a portion of a three-story bay on the house. However, the removal complies with the Standards; the elevation is a secondary façade and is not character defining.

The application also proposes site improvements including the creation of a paved outdoor space to the east and the modification of a surface parking lot to the west. The site will be enhanced with a perimeter planter; the historic iron fence does not exist, but would be replicated. The application proposes signage for the hotel.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10, and the New Additions, Setting, and Entrances and Porches Guidelines.

- The hotel addition complies with Standard 9. It “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.” The hotel addition will be constructed “so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that the character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.”
- The hotel addition complies with Standard 10. The “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.”
- The hotel addition complies with the New Additions Guidelines. It will be designed “in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.” The hotel will not imitate “a historic style or period of architecture.”
- The hotel addition complies with Standard 1. The “new addition to the historic building” is “required by the new use.”
- The hotel addition complies with the Setting Guidelines. The “new building” is not “out of character or otherwise inappropriate to the setting’s historic character.”
- The restoration of the historic house complies with Rehabilitation Standard 6 and the related Guidelines. “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.”
- The reconstruction and enclosing of the missing front porch from photographic and physical evidence complies with an Entrances and Porches Guideline, which recommends “designing and constructing a new entrance or porch when the historic entrance or porch is completely missing. It may be a restoration based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building.” The new porch will be a replica of the historic, c.1900 porch. The enclosing windows are compatible with the historic character of the building and reconstructed porch.

- The alteration of the bay on the south side of the building for the connector to the hotel building complies with an Entrances and Porches Guideline, which recommends “designing and installing additional entrances ... on secondary elevations when required for the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the building, i.e. limiting such alteration to such non-character-defining elevations.” The bay is not on a street elevation and views of it are currently blocked by the non-historic additions. The rear south façade is unquestionably a non-character-defining elevation.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Evans recused owing to his firm’s involvement in the project. Developer Tom Lussenhop, attorney Ron Patterson, and architects Sam Olshin and Andrew Curtis represented the application.

Before the project was introduced, attorney David Fineman asserted that the Committee should not hear the application. He claimed that the Committee cannot hear a new application when a previous application has been denied until the applicant has exhausted his appeal options on the denied application. He claimed that this application violates the defined process. Mr. Fineman then claimed that the current application had not been submitted within the timeframe stipulated in the Rules & Regulations. He claimed that his clients’ rights to review the materials had been abridged. He asked the Committee to defer the application until its next meeting.

Mr. Amburn rejected the claim that the developer could not submit a new application after the Commission denied his first application. He noted that the Committee would hear an application later at this meeting that had already been denied in other forms three times by the Commission. He explained that the Committee welcomes new applications that incorporate suggestions from the Committee after earlier applications have been denied.

Mr. Reuter, the Commission’s attorney, likewise categorically rejected Mr. Fineman’s claim that the developer could not submit a new application after the Commission denied his first application. He said that it was unreasonable to assert that a denial of an application precluded subsequent applications for the same property. He noted that the submission of subsequent revised applications after a denial is entirely routine; it occurs during almost every Commission review cycle. He stated that an applicant does not need to exhaust his appeal possibilities before submitting a new application. There is nothing in the Philadelphia Code or the Commission’s Rules & Regulations that would prevent an applicant from submitting new applications after a denial.

Mr. Reuter turned to the Commission’s authority to consider the impact of proposals for individually designated sites not in historic districts on surrounding properties. He cautioned the Commission and Committee to be very cautious and circumspect when considering the impacts of proposals for individually designated properties on what has been called “de facto” districts or National Register districts because those entities are outside the purview of the Commission. He stated that there is nothing in the historic preservation ordinance or the Rules & Regulations that allows the Commission to recognize historic districts other than those it has established. He noted that even a pending local district would not authorize the Commission to take impacts on other properties of proposals for individually designated sites into account. He noted that Section 14-2007(7)(k)(.4) does authorize the Commission to consider the effect on neighboring structures, surrounds, and streetscape. He stated that he reads that section strictly; he advised that it only authorizes the Commission to take into account the effect on neighboring structures, surrounds, and streetscape when the subject property is in a locally designated historic district, not a “de facto,” pending, or National Register district. He stated that the Commission should maintain the distinction between a district and an individually designated property. He stated

that there may be an argument for allowing the Commission to consider the impacts on adjoining properties, but he was adamant that the Commission must not extend its consideration beyond those that directly abut the property in question. He asked that the Commission be very cautious and circumspect when considering the impacts on abutting properties. He remarked that land use law is built around the original premise that the property owner has supreme constitutional rights with respect to the use of her property. He stated that the Commission must be very careful not to expand its authority beyond that provided by the strict letter of the law. He advised the Committee to continue with this review but to limit its review to an assessment of the compatibility of this proposal with the historic resources at this site.

Mr. Reuter stated that Section 6.3.d.2 of the Rules & Regulations require that applications must be submitted to the staff nine business days before the Committee's meeting. He explained that this is a rule, not a regulation; it does not guarantee public access to the application, but instead ensures that the staff has sufficient time to process the application. He added that the application materials were made available to the Committee and the public as required by the Rules & Regulations. In other words, the application submission may have been an inconvenience for the staff, but it did not preclude the public's rights to review and participate. He stated that applicants also routinely provide additional information at the public meetings.

Mr. Patterson stated that his client has the right to and may still appeal the denial by the Commission. However, the current application is a new and different application. It has been revised. He stated that his client has the right to proceed on a separate application. Mr. Fineman argued that everyone is entitled to a sense of fairness. He stated the new application is intended to "bleed" the protesters and is not fair.

Mr. Farnham addressed the question of the submission deadline. He cited Section 6.3.d.2 of the Rules & Regulations, which requires that an application be submitted nine working days prior to the Committee meeting. He noted that Mr. Fineman had selectively quoted from the section. The very next sentence states that the staff shall post at the Commission's office a list of applications to be reviewed by the Committee one week prior to the Committee meeting. He stated that the staff met that deadline and posted an agenda that included this application one week in advance of the meeting. The public only has an expectation of one week of advance notice of the agenda and it received that notice in this case. Mr. Farnham added that he also e-mailed the agenda to all registered interested parties one week in advance of the meeting. He reported that he knew that the opponents received that notification because a member of their group appeared in the Commission's office the following day to review the new application materials. He added that it is routine for the staff to waive its processing time; it does so nearly every review cycle. He concluded that the requirements establishing the public's right to review this application as stipulated in the Rules & Regulations have been met.

Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee.

Mr. Olshin presented a Powerpoint presentation. He showed photographs of the site and the surrounds to orient the Committee. He described the buildings in the neighborhood and stated that they are an eclectic mix of styles, sizes, and materials. He showed several historic photographs of the property. He discussed the current conditions, restoration plans, and site work. He assured the Committee that the historic house would be fully restored including the porch, missing bay, Palladian window, and grand stair. He and Mr. Curtis pointed out the inappropriate additions erected in the 1960s and 1970s. They stated that the additions would be removed and the house restored. Mr. Curtis stated that the red notes call out changes since the

last application. He stated that they are now proposing to restore the hairpin fence. He stated that the sidewalk and stairs from 40th Street will now be aligned with the front entrance and porch. He stated that they will retain as much of the side bay as possible for the connector to the hotel building. He will reset masonry in infilled window openings at the rear as prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. He discussed the off-site parking arrangement. He stated that they will restore the historic sidewalk.

Mr. Olshin described the hotel building. Mr. Curtis stated that the utilities will be buried. They described the trash storage and other features. They described the setbacks on Pine and 40th Streets. Mr. Olshin stated that he will not place any mechanical equipment on the roof. Mr. Olshin described the hotel floor plan. He showed shadow studies, which show that the shadows stay on the site except in the middle of the winter, when the sun is at its lowest. He described the exterior materials and noted that the height has been reduced to 10 stories from the original 11. The brick has now been wrapped around to the south as suggested. He also described the modifications to the design of the three-story section as suggested by the Committee and others. It is no longer a glass box, but is instead a masonry structure. He offered to work with the Commission on the cladding materials. Mr. Olshin discussed the window pattern, which considers a regular, not random, pattern. He stated that it is an ABC pattern that repeats. He pointed out how the proposed hotel building corresponds with the neighboring buildings. He acknowledged the concerns about signage and reported that they have redesigned the signage. He stated that the complex will be LEED certified or compliant, with a green roof, projecting windows, and energy efficiency.

Tom Lussenhop stated that the Planning Commission has reviewed and approved the project. He presented the Planning Commission's findings. He stated that the site is adjacent to a busy trolley stop, making this a transit oriented development. The Commission approved of the shared parking plan which uses existing capacity in an efficient way. He asserted that the project is smart growth. The Planning Commission approved of the use of a quiet, residential hotel on 40th Street, which would extend vitality down 40th Street. The Planning Commission applauded the proposal to provide guest housing for the hospitals and university. The Planning Commission also took into consideration height and density. Their traffic study concluded that the hotel would not impact adversely on the neighborhood. The shadow study shows that the building would cast limited shadows at certain times of year. He recalled Allan Greenberger's assertion that pedestrian experience occurs at street level. This project will enhance the pedestrian experience by removing the inappropriate additions, restoring the house, and adding vitality. It will provide open space. He stated the Planning Commission voted unanimously to approve the project, recognizing that the costs associated with the height will be more than offset by the benefits.

Mr. Amburn stated that use and other aspects of the project are outside the Commission's purview. He stated that the Commission is charged with protecting this individually designated historic resource. Mr. Fineman interjected, asking for clarification. He asked if it was the position of the Law Department that the Architectural Committee cannot consider the height and massing of the proposed building. Mr. Amburn replied that the Committee is charged with determining whether the proposed alterations and addition are compatible with this historic property. Height and massing have implications for compatibility; therefore, the Committee may consider them. Zoning and other matters are not within its purview. Mr. Fineman asked why the applicant presented photographs of buildings in the neighborhood when the Committee has been advised that it should limit its review to the property and the impact of the proposal on it.

Mr. Farnham stated that the task of the Architectural Committee is to determine whether the proposed alterations comply with preservation standards. He stated that the Committee should not assess the impact of this project on the general surrounding because the site is not located within a locally designated historic district. He stated that the architect is certainly welcome to learn from other buildings in the neighborhood and then apply what he has learned to his design for this site. Drawing from the context is very different than claiming that his design will or will not have a negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

John Gallery of the Preservation Alliance stated that, in his opinion, the Historical Commission rejected the application because the height of the hotel addition was “overwhelming”. He asked how the Committee should be guided by the Commission’s decision. Mr. Farnham categorically rejected Mr. Gallery’s assertion. He cautioned the Committee not to draw any conclusions about the intent of the Commission from statements made by one or two Commission members. He explained that the Commission’s action offered no justification for the denial. It simply denied the project as submitted. The action did not cite any preservation standards; it did not cite the historic preservation ordinance or the Rules & Regulations. Most of the Commissioners who voted against the project did not state their positions on the record. We do not know why the Commission as a whole rejected it, but they did not include a justification in their motion. Mr. Gallery asked if the minute from the Commission review was available. Mr. Farnham replied that the Rules & Regulations bar dissemination of the minutes until they have been adopted by the Commission.

Mr. Fineman asked that the supporters of the project in the audience present their views before his clients speak. Mr. Amburn stated that he would hear the members of the public as they presented themselves and not privilege on side or the other.

Dan Durtis, a resident and real estate developer, supported the project. He stated that he owns buildings directly across the street and on neighboring blocks. He stated that he believes that this is the only opportunity to develop the site that will include the restoration of the house. He advocated for the project because of the restoration of the house.

Jeff Block, a resident of the neighborhood, supported the project, which would be compatible with the historic setting. He commented on the desolate character of the corner and felt this project would add life and vibrancy to the street, improving the neighborhood. He stated that, as a realtor, he does not see any other options for the site.

Mary Brusinski, a resident of the 4200-block of Pine Street, stated that she and her family are committed to the area. She stated that she supports this project and appreciates the restoration proposed for the site. She stated that the restoration will be a huge gift to the corner of 40th and Pine. She stated that the development would be compatible with the house and neighborhood. She stated that this project will bring a sense of safety to the neighborhood. She acknowledged the need for a hotel in the neighborhood.

Mary Nixon, an architect who lives at 4017 Pine Street, said that her statement is based on the application material the staff had allowed the opponents to see. She accused the staff of withholding material. She stated that the Powerpoint presentation included material that she had not seen. She said the name “Campus Inn” does not do it justice; it should be called “my big fat greedy hotel.” She stated that the proposed building is too big and overwhelms the property. She stated the proposed development is out of character for the historic setting. Ms. Nixon said that the brick is too dark. She claimed that house would be altered to move the entrance to Pine Street. She claimed that the main entrance had always been located on 40th and would be

shifted to Pine. Views of the grand, Palladian window, a character defining feature, would be blocked. She stated the drawings are deceiving. The nearby structures are drawn too large or too far away, the overwhelming size of the addition is distorted, and the depicted trees will not grow owing to the lack of light and space. Ms. Nixon said that it is a proposal of excessive size, scale, proportion, and massing. It destroys the integrity of the mansion and its site. She stated the proposal has changed very little in the past year. The alterations are cosmetic. She stated that the project is driven by profit not preservation. She urged the Committee not to approve the project and to encourage the applicant to find another site for his hotel.

Mr. Farnham rejected Ms. Nixon's claim that the public did not have access to the entirety of the application materials. He stated that the entire application as submitted with all of the materials prepared by the staff was available to the public one week in advance of the meeting as required by the Rules & Regulations. Nothing was held back from the public. Ms. Nixon stated that a neighbor had visited the Commission's offices to review the application and make photocopies.

Mathew Grubel, a neighbor and preservationist, opposed the project. He noted that the designation of the property includes the building and its site. He claimed that the property satisfies Designation Criteria A, C, D, E, and J. He posited that the building was designed by Samuel Sloan. He spoke at length about the history of the neighborhood, which was developed as a garden suburb. He discussed Nathaniel B. Brown, who developed some properties in the neighborhood. He showed an image of Hamilton Terrace, which is located a few blocks away. He spoke about covenants and deed restrictions placed by mid nineteenth-century developers on some properties in the neighborhood. He discussed the Garden Court development, which is eight blocks west of this site and was developed in the 1920s. He spoke extensively about Clarence Siegal, who created Garden Court, especially about his requirements for light, air, and space. He spoke about parking at Garden Court. He discussed the topography of Garden Court. He described the "de facto," National Register, and pending historic districts in the area. He stated that the significance of this area derives from its relationship to greater historical trends. He conceded that he is not the first person to have recognized this fact about the significance, but that he has studied it in greater depth and detail than anyone else. He showed several photographs of the area. Mr. Gallery suggested that he conclude his comments. Mr. Grubel summarized the other testimony already provided by others. He discussed the materials proposed and materials used in the neighborhood. He spoke of the Woodlands, two blocks to the south. He said it would be an "absurdity" not to consider the impacts on other properties. Mr. Gallery again suggested that he conclude his comments. He asked rhetorically whether the work proposed to the house is a restoration. He apologized for speaking at length.

Guy Laren, who owns 4001 Baltimore Avenue, spoke for himself and the owner of the neighboring property at 4003 Baltimore. He claimed that the drawings showing the relationship of the proposed hotel building to the houses on Baltimore Avenue are not accurate. He stated that his property is not designated as historic. He asserted that approving this project would destroy the neighborhood's chances for district designation. He suggested a three to five-story building be constructed on the site.

Magali Larson, a neighbor and sociologist, stated that she was surprised that a second application for the hotel had been accepted. She stated that she is "indignant" because developers are affording privileges not offered to homeowners. She asserted that the historic preservation ordinance allows the Commission to consider the impact of projects on surrounding properties; she claimed that the Law Department's interpretation is incorrect. She stated that the project does not comply with preservation standards. She stated that the

mansion was designed to stand on a very generous lot with a large side yard. She stated that the project is driven by economics and makes a mockery of historic preservation.

Melanie Lamond, a neighbor and realtor, supported the application. She stated that she has renovated buildings in the neighborhood. She asserted that this important building should be saved, but its restoration will be very costly. She stated that the new construction must offset the cost of the restoration. She stated that the neighborhood around this corner is almost entirely apartment buildings, not single-family homes as some have claimed. She said that she has served as president of the University City Historical Society four times. She supports the project and believes that it will be compatible. She stated that the neighbors are opposing this project because they do not like change.

Mr. Gallery stated that the revised drawings show few changes. He stated that the three-story section of the hotel building is not compatible with the house. Its design should be revised.

Objecting to the claims that this 10-story building will detract from the neighborhood, Ms. Lamond stated that the historic row houses on St. Marks Place that back up to the 10-story Fairfax Building are some of the most valuable in the neighborhood. Mr. Laren disagreed.

Ms. Larson objected to the claim that some residents in the neighborhood do not like change. She also stated that the University should raise the funds needed to restore the building. Unlike the residents, the University has access to large sums of money.

Ed Halligan of the Spruce Hill Community Association said that comments presented today reflect the neighborhood, which is divided over the project. He stated that the neighborhood would never reach a consensus on the matter.

Mary Goldman, a resident of the 4100-block of Pine, stated that everyone in favor of the project is a realtor who is tied to the University. Several in the audience adamantly disagreed. Ms. Goldman opposed the project, stating that she does not want to have to walk on slippery sidewalks. She stated that she worries about her hips. She stated that the house is not worth saving.

Mr. Amburn closed the public discussion period. Mr. Grubel asked if the application was a new or revised. Mr. Amburn stated that he was out of order and then replied that the question was meaningless because every revised application is also a new application.

Ms. Pentz asked the applicants to confirm that the two sets of steps, at 40th Street and the porch, have been realigned to be centered on the doorway. Mr. Olshin answered that they are both centered on the doorway.

Ms. Pentz stated that she believes that the three-story building is competitive with the house. She added that competitive does not necessarily mean incompatible. She noted that it is primarily an issue of the height. She stated that she considered last month's three-story design to be more compatible with the house. She rejected the claim that the hotel would overwhelm the house. She contended that the 1960s additions totally encompass and overwhelm the house; the proposed project would benefit, not detract from, the historic house.

Mr. Amburn agreed with Ms. Pentz. He observed that the project will save and restore the historic resource that the Commission is charged to protect. He noted that the applicant has worked with the Commission and Committee to institute all of the suggested changes.

Mr. McCoubrey asked the architects why they choose the dark colored brick. Mr. Olshin replied that it seemed best to use a color that would contrast with the 10-story section so as to be seen as separate but related appendages. He offered to revise the color choice if so advised by the Committee.

Mr. McCoubrey stated that he is concerned about the three-story section because it competes with the house. He suggested that it should be revised to be more horizontal. He stated that it should be less assertive, more of a background structure. Mr. Amburn agreed. Ms. Gutterman also thought that the three-story section could be revised to be less obtrusive. Mr. Curtis stated that the three-story section was meant to engage with 40th street, be a public amenity, and be transparent. Ms. Gutterman stated that it appears very hard. Mr. Olshin stated that he is willing to revise the design of this section. Mr. Curtis said he would be happy to study the design.

Ms. Gutterman asked if there were any studies done to determine if it was possible to move the connector between the house and the hotel back one bay to the west to save the bay window on the south façade of the house. Mr. Curtis stated that they had studied the question at length and decided that that was the best location to save the most historic fabric inside and out.

Mses. Gutterman and Pentz stated that they would like to review another revision to the three-story section. Ms. Pentz explained to the architects that, if they cannot reduce the height of the three-story section, then they should be prepared to explain why they cannot. Mr. Amburn stated that the three-story section should be less aggressive. The Committee discussed how it would word its recommendation. Mr. Farnham advised the Committee that it must be very clear in its recommendation. He asked the Committee if it was recommending approval of the overall height and massing of the building. Mr. Amburn stated that it was. He stated that the Committee has concerns about the design of the three-story section on 40th Street and the colors of the materials, especially the dark brick on the appendages, but considers the rest of the project compliant with the Standards. He stated that a less contrasting color should be chosen for the cladding on the three- and six-story appendages.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted unanimously to recommend approval, provided three-story section on 40th Street is designed to be less competitive and more compatible with the historic house and the color of the cladding on the two appendages is changed to a less contrasting color, with the Architectural Committee and staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, and 10, and the New Additions, Setting, and Entrances and Porches Guidelines.

- The hotel addition complies with Standard 9. It “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.” The hotel addition will be constructed “so that there is the least possible loss of historic materials and so that the character-defining features are not obscured, damaged, or destroyed.”
- The hotel addition complies with Standard 10. The “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.”
- The hotel addition complies with the New Additions Guidelines. It will be designed “in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.” The hotel will not imitate “a historic style or period of architecture.”

- The hotel addition complies with Standard 1. The “new addition to the historic building” is “required by the new use.”
- The hotel addition complies with the Setting Guidelines. The “new building” is not “out of character or otherwise inappropriate to the setting’s historic character.”
- The restoration of the historic house complies with Rehabilitation Standard 6 and the related Guidelines. “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.”
- The reconstruction and enclosing of the missing front porch from photographic and physical evidence complies with an Entrances and Porches Guideline, which recommends “designing and constructing a new entrance or porch when the historic entrance or porch is completely missing. It may be a restoration based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building.” The new porch will be a replica of the historic, c.1900 porch. The enclosing windows are compatible with the historic character of the building and reconstructed porch.
- The alteration of the bay on the south side of the building for the connector to the hotel building complies with an Entrances and Porches Guideline, which recommends “designing and installing additional entrances ... on secondary elevations when required for the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the building, i.e. limiting such alteration to such non-character-defining elevations.” The bay is not on a street elevation and views of it are currently blocked by the non-historic additions. The rear south façade is unquestionably a non-character-defining elevation.

Mr. Evans joined the Committee

4351 MAIN STREET

Owner/Applicant: James Palmieri

History: c. 1905, Manayunk Special Controls Historic District

Project: Remove front door, create open-air vestibule

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to remove the front door in a storefront on Main Street, Manayunk and create an open-air vestibule behind the storefront windows. Door would lead from the vestibule to a first-floor commercial space and an upstairs dwelling. It is unclear whether the existing front door is original, but it is stylistically compatible with the storefront. The removal of the front door would result in the loss of the historic fabric and an adverse change to the spatial relationships of the storefront.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9, and Sections PM-704.2.5-6 of the Philadelphia Code (Main Street Manayunk National Historic District Special Controls).

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Patrick Hanningan and Robert Wachle represented the application.

Mr. Hanningan stated that the owner wished to create separate access to the upstairs apartments. He reported that he had first proposed complete demolition of the storefront, but

that the staff had advised him to redesign the proposal in order to minimize the impact on historic fabric. He asserted that the current proposal is the best solution.

Ms. Pentz asked if the exterior storefront door could be left in place. Mr. Hanningan stated that it would conflict with the apartment entrance door. He added that the stairs are set as far back as possible and that there was not enough interior space to create a landing.

Mr. Amburn noted that the loss of the display area of the storefront windows would be detrimental to the commercial character of Main Street. Mr. Hanningan stated that both the public and the tenant would have access to the display window.

Mr. Danta asked if there is any access at the rear of the building through an existing street. Mr. Wachle replied that the rear of the building is only accessible across a pay parking lot space.

Mr. Evans noted that creating an open-air vestibule would require the installation of weatherproofing on the walls and flooring. Mr. Amburn stated that the removal of the door would have a negative impact on the façade. He suggested that there are more sensitive alternatives.

Ms. Gutterman opined that the architect should take a closer look at the interior layout and perhaps seek a variance for the door clearance in the interior. She agreed with Mr. Amburn that the removal of the front door would have an adverse effect.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9, and Sections PM-704.2.5-6 of the Philadelphia Code (Main Street Manayunk National Historic District Special Controls).

1118 PINE STREET

Owner: Richard Verruni

Applicant: Paul Stone

History: c. 1843; individually designated 9/23/1963

Project: Install wood simulated-divided-light windows

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install wood, simulated-divided-light windows throughout this late Greek Revival townhouse in Washington Square West. The original windows for this building were wood true-divided-light windows in a six-over-six double hung configuration. The existing windows are replacements. The applicant proposes to install a wood replacement window that would be installed with jamb liners within the original wood frames. The replacement units would not be installed in subframes. The jamb liner installation allows the sizes of the glass panes to retain the proportions of the original window, thus replicating the dimensions and appearance of the original historic window exactly. The proposed muntin would have a putty slope and would be of a 7/8" measurement, just as the original true-divided-muntin would have been.

The Philadelphia Historical Commission has repeatedly approved applications for wood simulated-divided-light windows when the replacement replicates the size and pattern of the original. This application fulfills those requirements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Window distributor Paul Stone represented the application.

Mr. Stone displayed a sample window to the Committee members. Mr. Evans inquired whether the putty slope could be made steeper to allow for a thinner muntin profile. Mr. Stone replied that the thinnest muntin he can currently provide is 7/8" wide. He offered to speak to the manufacturer about offering a thinner muntin. He noted that the rails and stiles would also have to be modified to make the putty slope on the muntin steeper. Mr. Evans opined that the window as proposed was an acceptable replacement and encouraged the applicant to work with the manufacturer to fabricate a steeper putty slope for subsequent window replacements.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

4819 TRINITY PLACE

Owner: Ernie Leonard

Applicant: Kevin Creighton

History: c. 1890; individually designated, 1/28/1969

Project: Replace slate roof with asphalt shingles

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to replace the existing slate roof on this building with Grand Manor asphalt shingles, which replicate the appearance of slate. The Historical Commission reviewed and approved an identical application from the same applicant for a neighboring, identical property in April 2008. The current application is for a property on the same block, across the street from the one for which the application was previously approved. The Grand Manor asphalt shingle closely replicates the appearance of the original slate roof.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Kevin Creighton of Russell Roofing represented the application.

Ms. Sell distributed photographs of the neighboring property at 4806 Trinity Place. She explained that the shingles proposed in this application were recently approved by the Commission and installed on this neighboring house. She stated that the staff believes the Grand Manor asphalt shingles are a convincing substitute and simulates the appearance of slate. She added that copper ridge rolls would be installed.

Ms. Pentz inquired whether the "shangle" would have clipped corners. Kevin Creighton responded that all "shangles" have clipped corners like the ones that were approved at 4806 Trinity Place. He added that these will not be fish-scale in shape, but will have a small clip on bottom.

Mr. Creighton displayed photographs of a building where he installed Grand Manor asphalt shingles on the main block of the house, but retained the original slate on the turret. He opined that it is very difficult to perceive the difference between the two materials.

Mr. Evans inquired what the Commission's policy is on replacement roof materials on mansards. Ms. Sell responded that the Rule and Regulations do not authorize the staff to approve applications for installation of substitute roofing materials where the original slate exists

on turrets or mansards. She explained that the Architectural Committee recommended denial of the application as submitted, but approval of the installation of authentic slate on the mansard's front elevation and Grand Manor asphalt on the side and rear with copper ridge rolls for 4806 Trinity Place. She explained that, upon viewing a sample of the Grand Manor asphalt shingle, the Commission overturned the Committee's recommendation and approved the application for installation of the asphalt substitute on all elevations with copper ridge rolls.

Mr. Evans suggested that the Committee approve the application.

Mr. Baron rejected Mr. Evans suggestion and stated that, in the past, the Architectural Committee has universally required slate on mansards.

Ms. Gutterman inquired if the applicant considered a rubber simulated slate material. Mr. Creighton replied that the rubber material has many failures including durability of the material, color, installation methods, and weight. He stated that a regular thirty-year dimensional shingle weighs 250 pounds per square, the material he is proposing weighs 475 pounds per square, and authentic slate weighs 1000 pounds per square.

Mr. Evans observed that 4806 and 4819 Trinity are twins with adjoining properties. He questioned the treatment of the space in the center of the mansard that straddles the property line. The applicant stated that he will create a copper flashing separation as he did on 4806 Trinity. He added that he cut the slate from the neighbor and inserted a dividing strip down the center.

Ms. Pentz proposed that the Committee recommend denial again for consistency. Mr. Evans retracted his earlier suggestion and explained that he has a problem with flashing strips in center because it destroys the original architectural expression of the buildings.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial, pursuant to Standard 2, but approval of the installation of authentic slate on the mansard's front elevation and Grand Manor asphalt shingles on the side and rear elevations with copper ridge rolls.

1530-34 LOCUST STREET

Owner: Versailles Affiliates

Applicant: Carl Nixon

History: Versailles Apartment Building, 1920-1921, designed by Frederick Webber, Significant in the district

Project: Install awnings

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install awnings over basement openings. The awnings would be installed over blank masonry that aesthetically functions as the base for the first-floor balconies with arched French doors. The proposed awnings would be located entirely above the basement windows. The Versailles is one of the most prominent Beaux-Arts apartment buildings in the Rittenhouse Square Historic District. It is classified as significant in the district. The building is clad in terracotta. The applicant has not included installation details, but it is assumed that the awnings would be attached directly onto the terracotta cladding of the façade.

The staff contends that the spatial relationship between the basement and first floors would be adversely affected by the installation of awnings that would block from view the apparent

masonry support for the ground floor. The awnings would alter the proportions of the space, compromising the integrity of the architectural design. Furthermore, the installation of the awnings on terracotta cladding irreversibly damages historic fabric. Terracotta is difficult to patch or repair.

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Dov Leis represented the application.

Ms. Sell distributed photographs of the current openings between the windows. The majority of the terracotta bases are unaffected with the exception of three areas that have remaining bolt holes. Mr. Leis explained that the proposed awnings are intended to draw attention to the location and unify the basement retail space.

Mr. Amburn stated that the proposed awning location was unusual. He also suggested that the awnings might obstruct the sidewalk. The applicant stated that the drawings were inaccurate; the awnings would only project about 2 inches from the face of the building. The bottom of the awning is only 5'-6" above the sidewalk. Mr. Amburn stated that City regulations require a minimum of 8' above the sidewalk.

Ms. Pentz asked the applicant how the awnings would be attached to the terracotta. The applicant replied that the material is not terracotta but a cast stone material. He stated that he planned to use lead sinkers. He noted that some holes exist and may be reusable. Ms. Pentz stated that she would prefer no attachments to the building. Ms. Gutterman concurred.

Mr. Amburn opined that the awnings would disrupt the architectural composition. Mr. Leis reiterated his position that the awnings would attract attention and customers and improve the appearance of the building. Mr. Amburn said the signage in the windows could also be used to attract customers.

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

926 S. 2ND STREET

Owner: Dorothy Grosick

Applicant: Anthony Miksitz, architect

History: c. 1830; individually designated 5/31/1966

Project: Demolish rear roof, add 4th floor

OVERVIEW: This application proposes converting the attic level of this rowhouse into a fourth floor. The rear slope of the main roof would be demolished along with the rear chimney. A higher roof would be built behind the roof ridge, creating a clerestory at the ridge line. The construction of this addition would result in the demolition of historic fabric on the main body of the house and the new addition would be visible from the street in front of the house. A highly visible HVAC unit would be placed on the new roof.

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

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Property owner Dorothy Grosick and architect Anthony Miksitz represented the application.

Mr. Miksitz referred to the addition as a mezzanine level instead of a fourth floor. Mr. Amburn opined that the proposal to build above the ridgeline does not satisfy the standards. Mr. Miksitz informed the Committee that the homeowner is seeking additional space. He stated that the space in the house is limited. He explained that he could alter the design of the clerestory at the ridgeline to appear more like a skylight. Mr. Evans asserted that the gain in space would not justify the loss of historic fabric. Mr. Miksitz explained that the house is currently only 800 square feet. Every new square foot would be beneficial. He added that he intends to convert the bath and closet into a master bedroom. Mr. Miksitz noted that the Commission had approved a new dormer for his house. The staff explained that that situation is not analogous to this one. Ms. Pentz stated that altering the roofline of the historic building would not be appropriate. Mr. Amburn feared that an approval would set a negative precedent. The Committee members agreed with the staff recommendation.

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

1636 SPRUCE STREET

Owner: George Bochetto

Applicant: Mark D'Alonzo

History: c.1868, contributing to the Rittenhouse Fittler Historic District, 1995

Project: Add roof deck and stair house

OVERVIEW: This application proposes a scaled-back version of plans reviewed by the Committee and Commission in September 2006, December 2007, and March 2008. The application proposes to add a roof deck to this corner house with a mansard. The latest denial by the Commission was appealed to the Board of Licenses & Inspections Review, which sustained the Commission's decision. The current design has a stair house leading to a deck, but does not have the rooftop interior space included in past plans. It has been significantly scaled back from the earlier proposals.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the railing is redesigned with metal pickets and a mock up confirms that the deck is inconspicuous from the public right of way, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roof Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorney Ron Patterson and architect Mark D'Alonzo represented the application.

Mr. Baron informed the Committee he conducted a site visit to review a mock-up and found that the currently proposed stair house would be visible from the public right-of-way. He displayed photographs of the mockup. He said that he and the architect had discussed moving the stair house further south on the roof, but that the owner did not want to make the interior modifications necessary to allow that change. Mr. D'Alonzo submitted elevation drawings reflecting the design that was mocked up. He reported that the pilot house would stand about 10 feet above the roof to account for the new decking on top of the sloping roof. Mr. D'Alonzo stated that he has incorporated the Committee's earlier recommendations including removing the pool and reducing the size of the deck. Mr. Patterson stated that, after taking into account

the Commission's suggestions, the architect has reduced the proposed deck as much as possible.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the pilot house is covered in a material such as zinc to make it inconspicuous and more traditional looking; that deck rail is a non-reflective such as cable wire; and that the plantings are within and not higher than the deck rail.

1801-1813 WALNUT STREET

Owner: Philadelphia Urban Investors, LP

Applicant: Neil Sklaroff Esq.

History: 1801-03 Van Rensselaer Mansion, c. 1895-1898, significant in the district

1805-09 Walnut, Allison building, c. 1910, additions c. 1925, contributing in the district

1811-13 Rittenhouse Club, c. 1900, significant in the district

Project: Install signs and awnings

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install signs and awnings on the historic façade of the former Rittenhouse Club, the Allison Building, and the new commercial ground floor of the 10 Rittenhouse development on 18th and Sansom Streets.

The application proposes the following:

Historic façade of the Rittenhouse Club: The installation of awnings on the ground and second floors; a plaque to right-hand side of the doorway; and a plaque to the left-hand side of the doorway. All proposed signage would advertise Barney's New York, except the plaque to the right-hand side of the doorway that would advertise 10 Rittenhouse. The awnings would be installed within the masonry openings. It should be noted that the staff has approved the installation of two lanterns at either side of the doorway at the same location as the proposed plaques. The lanterns are not part of this application, but their locations are in conflict with the proposed plaque locations.

Allison Building: The installation of awnings on the fourth and fifth floors facing Rittenhouse Square. These awnings would be installed within the masonry opening and would not conceal the lintels with key stones above the windows. The application also proposes the installation of a 14-foot banner on the left-hand side of the façade at the fourth floor, and the installation of a plaque to the right-hand side of the doorway on Walnut Street and the installation of a two-sided blade sign to the left of the doorway on Walnut Street. All the proposed signage on the Allison Building would advertise the Red Door Spa.

10 Rittenhouse commercial spaces on 18th and Sansom Streets: Install signs over the entrances to the commercial spaces. This is new construction and no historic fabric would be altered or damaged. The application includes the installation of two plaques on the historic piers of the garden entrance to the Van Rensselaer Mansion. This area of the former garden is now the entrance to the 10 Rittenhouse condominium tower.

The staff contends that only the proposed 14-foot banner on the Allison Building would be in conflict with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. The façade of the Allison building is composed in a strict, uniform, Classical manner. The symmetry and balance of the facade would be altered by a banner on just one side of the building. This proposed change is in conflict with Standard 9.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval of all signage except the 14-foot banner at the fourth floor of the Allison Building, with the staff to review details, including installation details, pursuant to Standard 9.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Danta presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Attorneys Neil Sklaroff and Eileen Quigley, architect Miles Grosbard, and preservation consultant George Thomas represented the application.

Mr. Sklaroff explained that the applicant was very conscious of the location of the proposed signage. He felt that the proposed signage was very dignified. He also acknowledged the need for the tenants to advertise. He opined that his client would be willing to place another banner on the opposite side of the façade to balance the composition and overcome the staff's objection that the 14-foot banner would break the symmetry and rhythm of the façade. Mr. Grosbard stated that the banner was actually 12 feet tall; the additional two feet results from the flag pole itself.

Mr. Sklaroff asked the Committee if they would consider recommending approval with a time limit, during which the tenant could establish a clientele. He noted a limit of 24 months would be an acceptable. Mr. Evans offered that the clients who would patronize establishments such as Barney's NY and Red Door Spa would not be a walk-in clients. He questioned the effectiveness of the banner on those grounds. Mr. Amburn agreed with Mr. Evan's comments and stated that he would accept a blade sign at the street level. However, he deemed the banner above the cornice line architecturally inappropriate. He opined that the pedestrian only experiences the first two or three floors of a building.

Mr. Thomas introduced a variety of images depicting awnings and banners used across the city. He noted in particular a historic view of the Allison Building and its flag poles.

Mr. Sklaroff stated that the client understood the desire for subtlety, but requires the impact the banner would give. He added that his client is extremely conscious of the law. He commented that his client has hired him to attempt to repeal a city regulation forbidding a male masseuse to service a female patron as an example of his client's law abiding nature.

Ms. Gutterman asked the applicants if they had contacted Barnes & Noble to seek permission to use of their flag poles as signage. She noted that the flag poles are extant. Mr. Sklaroff replied that he had not.

Ms. Pentz recommended approval of the application as submitted. Messrs. Amburn, McCoubrey and Evans agreed with the staff recommendation and contended that the banner was too large for the location.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval of all signage except the 14-foot banner at the fourth floor of the Allison Building, with the staff to review details, including installation details, pursuant to Standard 9.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 12:45 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 4: Changes to a property that have acquired historic significance in their own right will be retained and preserved.

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 7: Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, will be undertaken using the gentlest means possible. Treatments that cause damages to historic materials will not be used.

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.

New Additions Guidelines: Recommended: Designing a new addition in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new. Not Recommended: Imitating a historic style or period of architecture in a new addition.

Entrances and Porches Guideline: Recommended: Designing and constructing a new entrance or porch when the historic entrance or porch is completely missing. It may be a restoration based on historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the historic character of the building.

Entrances and Porches Guideline: Recommended: Designing and installing additional entrances or porches on secondary elevations when required for the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the building, i.e. limiting such alteration to such non-character-defining elevations.

Setting Guidelines: Not Recommended: Introducing a new building or landscape feature that is out of character or otherwise inappropriate to the setting's historic character.

Roofs Guidelines: 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.

Building Site Guidelines: Recommended: Designing new onsite parking, loading docks, or ramps when required by the new use so that they are as unobtrusive as possible and assure the preservation of the historic relationship between the building or buildings and the landscape.

Windows Guideline: Not Recommended: Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of glazing; or the appearance of the frame.