

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

**TUESDAY, 25 SEPTEMBER 2012
ROOM 578, CITY HALL
DOMINIQUE HAWKINS, CHAIR**

PRESENT

Dominique Hawkins, Chair
John Cluver
Rudy D'Alessandro
Nan Gutterman
Dan McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz
Amy Stein

Jonathan Farnham, Executive Director
Randal Baron, Historic Preservation Planner III
Erin Cote, Historic Preservation Planner II
Rebecca Sell, Historic Preservation Planner II

ALSO PRESENT

Tim Shaaban, Urban Space Development
Tuval Shlomo, Star Contracting
Rosemary Goldman
Nathan Raleigh, Trinity Lutheran Church
Clifton Hayman, Trinity Lutheran Church
Diana Vidlak, Trinity Lutheran Church
R. Vogel
Katherine Franklin

CALL TO ORDER

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

ADDRESS: 233 CHESTNUT ST

Project: Restore exterior, construct fifth-story addition with roof decks
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: 233 Chestnut Street Development, LLC
Applicant: Tim Shaaban, Urban Space Development Inc
History: 1870
Individual Designation: 11/4/1976
District Designation: Old City Historic District, Contributing, 12/12/2003
Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to restore the front façade, which includes, washing the brick, repairing the brownstone elements, replacing windows, and reestablishing the historic

storefront configuration. The restoration is based on a period photograph from 1930. A more accurate restoration could be done if this photograph is used in conjunction with the 1857 Baxter Panoramic view of the street. The staff suggests that Jahn or a similar product would be a more appropriate repair method for the brownstone rather than paint.

This application also proposes to construct a fifth-story addition with a roof deck. The addition would be set back about 11 feet. However, a roof deck is proposed for front of the addition. The addition would have brick cladding and windows to match the restored façade.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided that the restoration of the storefront and windows is accurate, Jahn or a similar product is used for the brownstone repair, and a mock up of both the deck railings and addition proves that they will not be visible from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Tim Shaaban represented the application.

Ms. Cote stated that she and Mr. Shaaban met last week to discuss the application. She provided updated drawings showing the correct historic window configuration. She stated that it is believed that the door to the right in the historic 1930 photograph is the original historic door, because of the way the transom bar lines up with the column capitals. Mr. Shaaban stated that the transom glazing will be about 6 inches tall.

Mr. Shaaban informed the Committee that the outer storefront bays are fixed in place, not operable, currently. He stated that he proposes to restore the right bay to provide access to the upper floors and keep the left bay fixed but designed to match the historic door configuration. He stated that there is a ramp to the center door which over laps the right bay, which must be removed to be compliant with code. Mr. Shaaban asked for the Committee's advice on depressing the existing curb, lowering the door, and ramping inward for ADA compliance. He stated that the ramp cannot be located on the left side because of the utility vault access in that location. Ms. Hawkins asked about the material of the curb. Mr. Shaaban responded that he curb is a mixture of original marble, cement, and wood. He stated the building has been inappropriately altered over the years. Ms. Hawkins asked if there was any way to build up the sidewalk to meet ADA code. Mr. Shaaban stated that there is no room on the sidewalk to do so. He clarified that they are looking into cutting the curb or sill at the door down to the sidewalk level and having an interior ramp at both doors. Ms. Hawkins asked if he had a drawing to reflect his proposal. He replied that he wanted to have a conversation with the Committee about this issue to explore the options.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the visibility of the addition. Ms. Cote stated that the staff recommends the review of a mock-up. She commented that the proposed addition and railing will likely be visible and will need to be moved back from the front façade. Ms. Hawkins observed that this addition may be visible from oblique angles and suggested that the recommendation be contingent on a mock-up.

Ms. Gutterman asked about the proposed masonry restoration. Mr. Shaaban stated that some of the sills are stone and some are wood, and mostly likely all will be replaced. Ms. Pentz asked about the replacement material. Mr. Shaaban stated that that will depend on the original material. When asked about the restoration of the brownstone of the storefront, Mr. Shaaban replied that they would use a brownstone like material. Mr. McCoubrey stated that the staff has

recommended Jahn or a similar product, which is specifically formulated for brownstone patching and repair. The Committee members commented that the staff should carefully review the restoration materials for the front façade, given that the applicant has provided few details. Ms. Cote stated that the staff could review product information as well as samples on site. Ms. Gutterman stated that the drawings for the front elevation should be annotated with information regarding the existing materials and the proposed methods of restoration. Mr. Shaaban stated that he viewed the main part of the application as the addition, which still has to go through other review processes. He stated that the façade will not be restored for several months, allowing time to work out the details. He stated that he would be happy to come back and discuss the restoration details further. Ms. Hawkins asserted that the addition should be contingent on the restoration and should not be reviewed separately. The Committee members agreed that, in general, the application lacks important details.

Mr. Cluver stated that the addition may be visible. He observed that the rear of the addition is essentially two stories in height. Ms. Cote stated that the rear of the building is landlocked. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the transom on the façade of the addition be re-proportioned. He asked about the material of the band at the top of the addition. Mr. Shaaban stated that it is metal flashing. Ms. Hawkins stated that it appeared to be about 12 inches in height. Mr. Shaaban stated that there will be a slight overhang.

Mr. Baron suggested that the mock up include the deck railings as well. He contended that both the deck and addition as proposed will be conspicuous from the street and should be set back much farther. Mr. Cluver asked if the deck will be located directly on the roof. Mr. Shaaban stated that the deck will be composite and, as the roof slopes down toward the front, will be on the same level as the proposed fifth floor. The Committee members noted that the plans do not accurately indicate the slope of the roof. Mr. McCoubrey suggested that the elevations include the deck railings. Mr. Cluver stated that a roof plan may be helpful and asked about the features to be included in the mock up. Mr. Shaaban stated that they will use two-by-fours for the addition, railings, and elevator machine room.

Ms. Hawkins stated that there is not enough information and more information is needed for the Committee to make a recommendation regarding the alterations needed for ADA access. Mr. Shaaban stated that he could submit a letter from the Department of Licenses & Inspections regarding the requirements for the ADA access.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that the restoration of the storefront and windows is accurate, Jahn or a similar product is used for the brownstone repair, and a mock up of the deck railings , addition, and elevator machine room indicates that they will not be visible from the public right-of-way, with the staff to review details, and denial of the alteration to the doorways, pursuant to Standards 6 and 9

ADDRESS: 336 S 02ND ST

Project: Construct roof deck

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Harvey Schwartz

Applicant: Tuval Shlomo, Star Painting and Sons LLC

History: 1973; G.E. Smith, architect

Individual Designation: None

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

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

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to construct roof deck and trellis on the rear portion of the house. The proposal includes building up the parapet with a planter box on top. Enclosure for the HVAC units is also proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Cote presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Tuval Shlomo represented the application.

Ms. Gutterman asked if the tile on the rooftop already exists. Mr. Shlomo stated that the existing roof membrane can be walked upon. He also noted that the doors already exist. He stated that the property owner is open to any materials the Commission prefers.

Ms. Gutterman asked about visibility. Ms. Cote responded that that the deck will be visible from the public right-of-way. It may be obliquely visible from a bank parking lot, but the parking lot is not considered a public right-of-way. Mr. Shlomo stated that the roof is visible only from certain sections of the parking lot. Mr. Cluver asked about the visibility from Delancey Street. Mr. Shlomo stated it is not visible from Delancey Street.

Mr. Cluver asked if they propose to build up the chimney, given the height of the proposed enclosure near the chimney. He stated that the chimney might need to be built up to meet clearance requirements. Mr. Shlomo stated that the property owner is pursuing this design and will submit another application should modifications be needed.

The Committee expressed concerns that the pergola may make this deck visible from the public right-of-way.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend approval, provided that a mock up indicates that the railing, enclosures, and pergola are minimally visible from the public right-of-way, and provided that the chimney is not extended, pursuant to Standard 9 and the Roofs Guidelines.

ADDRESS: 668 N 15TH ST

Project: Legalize roof deck
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: John Makridakis
Applicant: Victor Mejia, The Azteco
History: 1859
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Spring Garden Historic District, Contributing, 10/11/2000
Staff Contact: Erin Cote, erin.cote@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the construction of a roof deck on the rear ell. The deck is accessed from a window that was cut down to a door. The railing for the deck is a six-foot stockade fence. The staff suggests that a metal rail with vertical pickets would be more appropriate.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, provided the stockade fence is replaced with a 42" simple black metal rail, pursuant to Standard 9.

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

Ms. Cote stated that the applicant is in poor health and is unable to attend the meeting. She stated that she spoke with the applicant and he prefers the stockade fence to shield his dog from barking at the neighborhood and prevent the dog from jumping off the deck. Ms. Hawkins suggested that there other ways to screen a deck.

Mr. Cluver observed that the deck is very prominent and unsightly. Ms. Gutterman stated that it is very visible from the public right-of-way. Mr. Cluver stated that he thought the Committee could not recommend approval of any deck in this location, given its visibility.

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

ADDRESS: 3452 MIDVALE AVE

Project: Legalize replacement of retaining wall
Review Requested: Final Approval
Owner: Rosemary R. Goldman
Applicant: Rosemary R. Goldman
History: 1930
Individual Designation: None
District Designation: Tudor East Falls Historic District, Contributing, 10/9/2009
Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to legalize the demolition of the original Wissahickon schist garden wall and construction of a brown stone retaining wall. The wall runs along the front of the property at the sidewalk. This work was done without the approval of the Historical Commission or a permit from the Department of Licenses and Inspections. A building permit is required for this type of retaining wall whether the property is designated as historic or not.

One of the character-defining features of the Tudor East Falls Historic District, described in the inventory, are the “front gardens afforded by setbacks, continuity of these gardens, a lack of front property-line fences, [and] extensive use of fieldstone garden walls ...”

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

DISCUSSION: Ms. Sell presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Owner Rosemary Goldman represented the application.

Ms. Goldman stated that her husband would have attended the meeting, but he is currently hospitalized for injuries. She stated that she submitted photographs of the work. Ms. Hawkins asked why she replaced the garden wall. Ms. Goldman explained that in June 2011 the wall was in disrepair and she had the wall reconstructed using the original schist stone. She stated that the wall had deteriorated again by August 2012. Therefore, she explained, she purchased new brownstone and reconstructed the wall with mortar behind the joints. She stated that she was advised that the new stone was the same as the original stone. Ms. Pentz asked if the original stone was laid with mortar. Ms. Goldman asserted that it was not and explained that the landscaper installed mortar at the back of the wall when it was rebuilt. Ms. Pentz explained that mortar traps moisture and could cause deterioration in the stone. Ms. Hawkins asked if the applicant had any photographs of the wall before it was rebuilt. Ms. Goldman stated that she did not have any photographs from before the work. Ms. Gutterman stated that the new stone does not match the neighbor’s original stone. Ms. Hawkins explained that the work required a permit and, if a permit was sought, the permit review would have triggered review by the Commission. Ms. Goldman explained that she thought that replacement in-kind would not require a permit. Ms. Hawkins explained that retaining walls require permits. She also noted that the wall was not replaced in-kind owing to use of a different stone. Ms. Goldman argued that the stone is a natural sandstone found in adjacent properties and that varying stones are used in house facades along the street. Ms. Pentz observed that the buildings and garden walls were built with local stone and the new material was a stone quarried elsewhere. Ms. Goldman asserted that the local stone in the wall was in a deteriorated condition. Ms. Pentz explained that there are thousands of buildings and walls in the area that were constructed with the local Wissahickon schist, which will last forever. Mr. Cluver stated that photographs showing the wall previous to the replacement would help the Committee understand the deteriorated condition of the original wall as well as dimensions, size, color, and other features of the wall and stone. Mr. Cluver argued that schist used in the area is a rustic-looking stone whereas the brownstone used has an engineered, uniform appearance. Ms. Goldman explained that she chose the stone because it complements the house.

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

ADDRESS: 2136-42 E DAUPHIN ST

Project: Install signage

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Philadelphia Federal Credit Union

Applicant: Michael McCullin, Fourth River Signworks

History: 1896; 26th District Police Station; John T. Windrim, architect

Individual Designation: 7/5/1984

District Designation: None

Staff Contact: Rebecca Sell, rebecca.sell@phila.gov, 215-686-7660

OVERVIEW: This application proposes to install signage on the east elevation of this building. Built in 1896 as the 26th District Police Station, this historic building is undergoing an extensive rehabilitation for reuse as a bank on the first floor and residential apartments on the second and third floors.

The proposed signage includes 34 metal letters to be installed with studs and adhesive on the brick elevation above the second-story windows. No attachment information has been provided regarding size, number, or placement of the studs. An internally-illuminated aluminum and acrylic box sign with push-through letters on urethane brackets and steel backer is proposed on the first-story adjacent to the carriage entrance. The total height of the sign measures less than seven feet. The first-story façade is articulated with a patterned banding of dentiled bricks that horizontally wrap the elevation. The vertical sign would be installed over this feature. No attachment information has been provided.

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

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

Ms. Hawkins stated that she has concerns with attachments, verticality, illumination, and penetrations for electrical conduit. Ms. Gutterman stated that she has concerns with the size and location of the sign as well as the need for the pin letters. Ms. Pentz stated that it appears as though the proposal would cause permanent damage to the masonry. Mr. Cluver stated that it appears as though the historic signage was a brownstone band over the door. He asked the staff if there were other potential locations on the building to which the Committee could direct the applicant. Ms. Sell responded that the building was a police station and signage was limited. She explained that she met with the applicant several times and directed him to similar buildings with signage, such as the Hyperion Bank on 2nd and Girard Streets. She acknowledged that historically the Hyperion Bank was a bank building that afforded the signage type similar to what is proposed in this application. She argued that the space and location is not afforded on police station building. She explained that she gave the applicant suggestions about more appropriate locations, attachment, size, and material, but that he chose to move forward with the proposed application. Mr. D'Alessandro stated that the main entrance is large and the transom might be a more appropriate signage location. Ms. Sell stated that the carriage entrance will be fully glazed and be the main storefront entrance for the bank. She added that she had discussions with the applicant about the concern to get attention to the bank; it is within a residential area and Trenton Avenue and Dauphin Street are not main thoroughfares. She explained that they discussed options to grab attention from Frankford Avenue with the use of a banner or projecting sign that would be held away from the face of the façade and attached within the

frame of the main entrance or between mortar joints so as not to cover the decorative brick banding.

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

ADDRESS: 5300 GERMANTOWN AVE

Project: Replace fence and legalize replacement of fence

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Trinity Lutheran Church

Applicant: Clifton Hayman, Trinity Lutheran Church

History: 1856; Trinity Lutheran Church (1856) and Church (Sower) House (1723, 1755); Jacob & George A. Binder, designers of church

Individual Designation: 5/28/1957

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: The Trinity Lutheran Church complex in Germantown includes an eighteenth-century church house on Germantown Avenue, a mid nineteenth-century Italianate church set back from Germantown Avenue, and a graveyard that runs along Queen Lane.

A long fence with several gates runs along Queen Lane from the rear of the church house to the rear property line. A section of the old fence was recently removed and replaced with a new black metal fence without the Historical Commission's approval. A second section awaits removal and replacement. The congregation would like to replace all of the fencing on Queen Lane. It contends that the old fence had been damaged by a falling tree and was in general disrepair. The application proposes legalization of the replaced section and approval of the replacement of the second section.

The new fence is the same height as the old fence, but does not match it in design. The old fence consists of decorative cast iron posts at the gates and metal hairpin fencing and gates. The decorative posts and hairpin gates will be retained. The removed section of hairpin fence has not yet been disposed of and is currently stored at the site.

The staff will undertake research to identify the design of the original fence. If the hairpin fence proves to be the original fence, it should be repaired and reinstalled.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Clifton Hayman, Diana Vidlak and Nathan Raleigh represented the application.

Mr. Baron explained that the posts are rather ornate and the hairpin section in between appears simpler. This led staff to undertake research to determine if an earlier fence existed. The staff did not find a decisive photograph, but surmises that the hairpin fence is not original to the 1856 building, but probably dates to the late nineteenth or early twentieth century. He explained that, in addition to the damage from the tree, there are loose connections where the sections attach to the posts. Ms. Pentz explained that the old fence could be repaired and that the Standards call for repair rather than replacement whenever feasible.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE, 25 SEPTEMBER 2012

PHILADELPHIA HISTORICAL COMMISSION

PHILADELPHIA'S PRINCIPAL PUBLIC STEWARD OF HISTORIC RESOURCES

Mr. Hayman said that the church administrators did not think that the church building itself was designated as they had not been able to secure funding through the National Register or the Preservation Alliance. They were under the impression that they could not because the church was not historically listed. He said that the congregation is composed of 40 members and that they installed a metal not a wooden fence. Mr. Hayman said that Mr. Baron has given him a copy of the minutes of the meeting when the church was listed on the Philadelphia Register of Historic Places.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the church sought a permit to do the work. Mr. Hayman explained that they thought they did not need a permit to replace an existing fence. Mr. Hayman said that his contractor said that it was not worth repairing this fence and that, in any case, it would be more expensive to repair it. Ms. Hawkins asked if Mr. Hayman has obtained any quotes for the cost of repair. He said he had not. Mr. Baron explained that contractors who sell new fencing typically do not repair fences. He said that he could give Mr. Hayman the names of people who repair and cast metal fencing. Ms. Hawkins said that the Commission has a financial hardship review process and also sometimes considers proposals to repair over time to lessen the immediate financial burden.

Ms. Hawkins asked if the public would like to comment. Richard Vessel, a neighbor on Queen Lane, said that he also has a hairpin fence that he has repaired. He said that, in his opinion, all sections of the fence appear repairable with the exception of the one piece hit by a falling tree.

Catherine Franklin, who said she owns the property adjacent to the church, explained that her family was Lutheran. She summarized what work had been done and also voiced concern about the steeple, which she claimed is in very poor condition. She asked that all of it be preserved.

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

ADDRESS: 216 S JESSUP ST

Project: Install door and paint masonry

Review Requested: Final Approval

Owner: Barbara Arvanitis

Applicant: Barbara Arvanitis

History: 1845

Individual Designation: 2/28/1961

District Designation: None

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

OVERVIEW: This submission is presented as two applications. One application proposes to remove a non-historic door and replace it with a second non-historic door, which has no historical basis. The other application proposes to paint the brick front façade of the building a brown color that has no relation to the brick-red color inherent to the historic material. The building is currently painted an off white color. For applications proposing to paint previously-painted brick facades, the Commission has routinely required either the removal of the paint and exposure of the brick or, if removal is not feasible, the painting of the façade to replicate the underlying red color of the brick.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Denial, pursuant to Standard 6.

DISCUSSION: Mr. Baron presented the application to the Architectural Committee. Barbara Arvanitis represented the application.

Mr. Baron showed photographs of buildings painted the brick red color that the Commission has often approved to repaint brick. He explained that the red has been a good match for brick and that the Commission has had a history of requiring this color. He said that, if one does not use the underlying color as a basis for painting masonry, then color selections become purely a matter of taste. Lime green or purple have the same legitimacy as yellow or tan. He showed a photograph of a red, white, and blue façade at 2nd and Market Streets next to a brick-red painted façade.

Ms. Arvanitis read a prepared letter into the record to support her application. Ms. Arvanitis displayed an image of her preferred door. Ms. Hawkins asked if the staff had provided guidance on the door. Mr. Baron showed two door variations that the staff said they could approve at the staff level, a five-panel Greek Revival door and a four-panel Italianate door. Mr. Baron showed that the building straddled those two styles in time and design. Ms. Arvanitis explained that she wished to install a four-panel door to match her approved shutters, but proposed to have three glass panes above to provide light. Mr. Baron suggested that Ms. Arvanitis retain her existing door, since it has six panes of glass and is in good condition. Ms. Arvanitis said that it is in good condition, but still somewhat drafty. Ms. Hawkins explained that one could weatherstrip the door. Ms. Arvanitis showed documents related to several staff approvals of doors in the neighborhood with glass panels. Committee members did not find those doors to be equivalent to the proposed door because they maintained the appropriate panel pattern with glazing replacing some panels.

On the paint proposal, Ms. Arvanitis showed her proposed putty brown color. She showed a photograph of painted buildings on her block, most of which were painted cream colors. Mr. Cluver said that the Committee had recommended approval of cream on the side facade of a building last month and noted that he found cream appropriate in some cases because of a history of white washing buildings. He did not find this color appropriate. Ms. Gutterman suggested that a building with so many layers of paint should be stripped rather than repainted because the paint does damage to the brick.

ARCHITECTURAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION: The Architectural Committee voted to recommend denial of both the door and paint applications, pursuant to Standard 6.

ADJOURNMENT

The Architectural Committee adjourned at 10:55 a.m.

STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES CITED IN THE MINUTES

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

Standard 5: Distinctive materials, features, finishes, and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property will be preserved.

Standard 6: Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

Standard 9: New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction will not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new works shall be differentiated from the old and will be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

Standard 10: New additions and adjacent or related new construction will be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.

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.