

**CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS
HERITAGE PRESERVATION COMMISSION STAFF REPORT**

FILE NAME: 1801 1st Avenue South

CATEGORY/DISTRICT: Contributing structure to the Stevens Square Historic District

CLASSIFICATION: Certificate of Appropriateness

APPLICANT: Chris Wegscheid (651) 255-8623

DATE OF APPLICATION: August 26, 2008

PUBLICATION DATE: August 19, 2008

DATE OF HEARING: August 26, 2008

APPEAL PERIOD EXPIRATION: September 2, 2008

STAFF INVESTIGATION AND REPORT: Brian Schaffer (612) 673-2670

REQUEST: New Windows, Window Sills, and Other Exterior Repairs and Replacements

A. SITE DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND:

The property located at 1801 1st Avenue South is a contributing building to the Stevens Square Historic District. The Steven’s Square Historic District is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is a locally designated district. The three-story brick apartment building was built in 1914 by Nels Bruce and designed by Lindstrom and Almars.

The exterior building material of the 1st Avenue and 18th Street facades is hard red brick. This brick returns into the non-street facing facades of the south and east before turning into a soft yellow brick. The building displays a prominent cornice that extends along the north and west facades.

The applicant is applying for a Certificate of Appropriateness to complete exterior work that includes window replacement, sill replacement, entry work, masonry work, and other exterior repairs and replacements.

B. WINDOWS: SASH AND FRAMES

DESCRIPTION

According to the applicant the typical windows are wood, double-hung units. The window sashes are not original to the building: original weighted sashes were replaced with wood sash kits and jamb liners circa 1980. The current replacement sashes have no divided lights and the original pattern is unknown. However, a 1967 historical photo shows a three-over-one divided light pattern. The frames and sashes have a painted exterior and varnished interior. The windows at the west and north elevations have steel lintels and the windows on the north and east elevations have arched masonry heads.

According to the applicant “the windows are in generally poor condition, as sash kits have not held up to use. Many lower sashes fall closed when opened, creating a nuisance and safety hazard. Windows do not seal effectively against drafts.” The existing exterior paint color is tan. The applicant states that the paint is lead-based and is flaking and in very poor condition. The historical photo shows dark-painted frames, sashes and trim at exterior. The windows have a combination storm window and screen window mounted to the exterior of the window openings.

PROPOSED WORK

The applicant is proposing to replace the non-original double-hung windows with aluminum single-hung replacement units installed inside the existing wood frames with an exterior metal panning. The window type will be a Quaker Pamela single-hung window with a three-over-one muntin pattern to match the pictorial evidence the applicant has of the earlier window design. The window muntins will be installed to the interior and exterior of the windows creating a simulated divided light pattern. The paint color of the frames, sashes, panning, and screen frames will be dark bronze. The combination storm window and screens will be removed and not used with the new windows as the new windows have an integrated half screen.

The applicant states that “setting replacement windows inside the existing frames, rather than installing brick-to-brick more closely matches existing sightlines, and allows interior casings (that are attached to frames) to remain.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicant has provided information indicating that the existing windows are not the original windows to this structure. While the applicant has not been able to determine what the original window style was the applicant has been able to provide pictorial evidence from 1967 showing that the windows were a three over one light window.

The applicant has proposed the method of partial replacement that includes applying metal panning over the wood frame and replacing the sash. The operation of the windows would change from double-hung to single-hung. Wrapping the wood frames with metal panning would significantly alter the look of the building. The building at 1926 3rd Avenue South, which is similar to 1801 1st Avenue South, received approval for a window panning similar to what is proposed for 1801 1st Avenue South. After reviewing the completed work, staff believes that the alteration substantially alters the building (see Appendix 5). In addition, panning over the wood is not a recommended course of action in particular when window frames are in need of repair work.

The proposed windows will have a simulated divided light pattern as muntins will be applied to the front and back of the windows. The simulated divided light pattern will not convey the same visual context as a true three-over-one divided light window pattern.

C. WINDOWS: BASEMENT WINDOWS AT EAST AND SOUTH ELEVATIONS

DESCRIPTION

The basement windows on the south and east elevations, the non-street facing facades of the structure, are awning type otherwise similar to typical windows. Most of the basement window openings at these elevations have been previously infilled with concrete block, brick, plywood or mechanical louvers and vents, or some combination of same. The openings at these two elevations have arched masonry heads.

PROPOSED WORK

The applicant is proposing to leave the infilled openings. The openings with louvers or vents in plywood to be reclad with fiber cement panels painted dark bronze. The existing three window openings on the south façade and two openings on the east façade are proposed to be glass block and custom prefinished metal panning at the jambs and head (to match arched masonry opening).

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicant states that the existing windows are not the original windows to this structure. The proposed work is on non-character defining façades. The glass block windows still convey the location of the existing window.

D. WINDOWS: SILLS SOUTH AND EAST ELEVATIONS

DESCRIPTION/CONDITION ANALYSIS/PROPOSAL

The original sills of the structure are rowlock brick. The applicant states that the rowlock brick sills are heavily deteriorated on the south and east elevations. Some of the sill have been previously replaced with mortar washes or replaced entirely with cast-in-place concrete sills. These previous repairs, however, were poorly executed and have since deteriorated and are need of repair. The applicant is proposing to replace all of the sills on the south and east elevations with cast stone sills in a buff color.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The original sills of the entire structure are a rowlock brick design. The south side of the structure has seen a variety of incompatible repairs including cement sills. Staff believes that introducing a cast stone sill type, when not original to the structure, does not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards. Staff believes repairing and replacing the deteriorated brick sills and replacing the previously installed concrete sills with the rowlock brick style would meet the Secretary of Interior Standards.

E. BUILDING ENTRIES

DESCRIPTION/CONDITION ANALYSIS/PROPOSAL

The front entrance door and frames will be repaired in place and painted to match existing. The rear entry door is not original and is a solid core wood door with a half-light set in a wood frame. The door surround is painted plywood and is in fair condition according to the applicant. The applicant is proposing to clad the door surround in smooth fiber-cement lap siding with an 8 inch exposure and replace the wood casing with fiber-cement trim. The materials will be painted a Sawdust color.

The rear entry landing and stairs are made of pressure-treated lumber. The applicant is proposing to add pressure-treated wood pickets to infill the noncompliant openings in the guardrail of the landing and stair.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The proposed rear entry is not in character with the building. Introducing a new element such as lap siding for the door surround will not be in keeping with the spirit and intent of the Secretary of the Interior Standards. The Stevens Square Historic Guidelines state that all exposed wood, even decks shall be painted. The existing rear deck and stairs and the proposed pickets are not painted and are not in compliance with the guidelines. The proposed Sawdust paint color may be too light in color.

F. MASONRY: WEST AND NORTH FACADES

DESCRIPTION/CONDITION ANALYSIS/PROPOSAL

The existing brick is a hard red brick and the applicant states that the condition of the brick on these facades is in generally good condition. The applicant is proposing tuck-point 100 percent of the wall above cornice and at the three sides of the bay projection on the west elevation. 5-10% of remaining wall area will be tuckpointed, including the rowlock sills. The applicant estimates the replacement of up to forty bricks. The mortar will match the composition and texture of existing mortar, with the mortar pigments to produce colors required and the joints will be tooled to match existing.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicant’s proposal meets the Secretary of Interior Standards.

G. MASONRY: EAST AND SOUTH FACADES

DESCRIPTION/CONDITION ANALYSIS/PROPOSAL

The existing brick on these elevations is a soft yellow brick, with the exceptions of returns of hard, red brick at the northeast and southeast corners. According to the applicant the condition of the brick varies greatly in condition depending on historical exposure to water. Many of the openings have cracks running away from the corners. The applicant is proposing to repair the cracks.

The east parapet has been covered with a galvanized sheet metal above the cornice line. The applicant does not know the condition of the brick, but anticipates that is severely deteriorated. The applicant is proposing to tuck-point 100 percent of the area above the cornice and less than 5 percent of the remaining wall area. They estimate that up to 600 bricks will need to be replaced along the parapet and the arched windows

Large areas of the south elevations have been previously repaired with irregular parge coats. The applicant does not intend to do work on these areas.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicant's proposal meets the Secretary of Interior Standards.

H. LIGHT MONITORS ON ROOF

DESCRIPTION/CONDITION ANALYSIS/PROPOSAL:

The structure has six light monitors located in three pairs of two on the roof. The peak of the shed roofed light monitors projects four feet above the parapet wall. The light monitors are located seven feet from the roof edge and are not visible from the street. The light monitors each have one south facing window with their exteriors covered in horizontal aluminum siding with a 12 inch exposure. The roofs of the monitors are shingled, but are currently covered by a tarp.

The applicant is proposing to replace the window in the light monitor with a fixed aluminum windows in the existing opening. The applicant is proposing to replace the siding with 10.75 inch exposure fiber cement lap siding painted in a sawdust color. The roof will be replaced with a EPDM membrane.

STAFF ANALYSIS

The light monitors have seen many repairs and the original design is not known. The light monitors are not visible from the street and are not a character defining feature.

I. MAIN ROOF

DESCRIPTION/CONDITION ANALYSIS/PROPOSAL:

The applicant is proposing to replace the membrane covered flat roof with and EPDM membrane of 4.5 inches of insulation. Prefinished metal flashings and roof edges will be replaced as required

STAFF ANALYSIS

The applicant's proposal meets the Secretary of Interior Standards.

L. GUIDELINE CITATIONS:

The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (1990)

Windows

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving windows - and their functional and decorative features - that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. Such features can include

frames, sash, muntins, glazing, sills, heads, hoodmolds, paneled or decorated jambs and moldings, and interior and exterior shutters and blinds.

Protecting and maintaining the wood and architectural metal which comprise the window frame, sash, muntins, and surrounds through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coating systems.

Making windows weather tight by recaulking and replacing or installing weather-stripping. These actions also improve thermal efficiency.

Evaluating the overall condition of materials to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, i.e. if repairs to windows and window features will be required.

Repairing window frames and sash by patching, splicing, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing. Such repair may also include replacement in kind of those parts that are either extensively deteriorated or are missing when there are surviving prototypes such as architraves, hoodmolds, sash, sills, and interior or exterior shutters and blinds.

Replacing in kind an entire window that is too deteriorated to repair - if the overall form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. If using the same kind of materials is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Designing and installing new windows when the historic windows (frame, sash and glazing) are completely missing. The replacement windows may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the window openings and the historic character of the building.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Designing and installing additional windows on rear or other non-character-defining elevations if required by the new use. New window openings may also be cut into exposed party walls. Such design should be compatible with the overall design of the building, but not duplicate the fenestration pattern and detailing of a character-defining elevation.

Providing a setback in the design of dropped ceilings when they are required for the new use to allow for the full height of the window openings.

Not Recommended:

Removing or radically changing windows which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Changing the number, location, size or glazing pattern of windows, through cutting new openings, blocking-in windows, and installing replacement sash which does not fit the historic window opening.

Changing the historic appearance of windows through the use of inappropriate designs, materials, finishes, or colors which radically change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of the glazing; or the appearance of the frame.

Obscuring historic window trim with metal or other material.

Stripping windows of historic material such as wood, iron, cast iron, and bronze.

Failing to provide adequate protection of materials on a cyclical basis so that deterioration of the windows results.

Retrofitting or replacing windows rather than maintaining the sash, frame, and glazing.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of historic windows.

Replacing an entire window when repair of materials and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.

Failing to reuse serviceable window hardware such as brass lifts and sash locks.

Using a substitute material for the replacement part that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the window or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Removing a character-defining window that is unrepairable and blocking it in; or replacing it with a new window that does not convey the same visual appearance.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced window is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

Introducing a new design that is incompatible with the historic character of the building.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Installing new windows, including frames, sash, and muntin configuration that are incompatible with the building's historic appearance or obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features.

Inserting new floors or furred-down ceilings which cut across the glazed areas of the windows so that the exterior form and appearance of the windows are changed.

Entrances and Porches

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving entrances - and their functional and decorative features - that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as doors, fanlights, sidelights, pilasters, entablatures, columns, balustrades, and stairs.

Protecting and maintaining the masonry, wood, and architectural metal that comprise entrances and porches through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and re-application of protective coating systems.

Evaluating the overall condition of materials to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, that is, if repairs to entrance and porch features will be necessary.

Repairing entrances and porches by reinforcing the historic materials. Repair will also generally include the limited replacement in kind - or with compatible substitute material - of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of repeated features where there are surviving prototypes such as balustrades, cornices, entablatures, columns, sidelights, and stairs.

Replacing in kind an entire entrance or porch that is too deteriorated to repair - if the form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Designing and constructing a new entrance or porch if 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.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Designing enclosures for historic porches when required by the new use in a manner that preserves the historic character of the building. This can include using large sheets of glass and recessing the enclosure wall behind existing scrollwork, posts, and balustrades.

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

Not Recommended:

Removing or radically changing entrances and porches which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Stripping entrances and porches of historic material such as wood, iron, cast iron, terra cotta, tile and brick.

Removing an entrance or porch because the building has been reoriented to accommodate a new use.

Cutting new entrances on a primary elevation.

Altering utilitarian or service entrances so they appear to be formal entrances by adding paneled doors, fanlights, and sidelights.

Failing to provide adequate protection to materials on a cyclical basis so that deterioration of entrances and porches results.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of historic entrances and porches.

Replacing an entire entrance or porch when the repair of materials and limited replacement of parts are appropriate.

Using a substitute material for the replacement parts that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the entrance and porch or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Removing an entrance or porch that is unrepairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new entrance or porch that does not convey the same visual appearance.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced entrance or porch is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

Introducing a new entrance or porch that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

Alterations/Additions for the New Use

Enclosing porches in a manner that results in a diminution or loss of historic character such as using solid materials such as wood, stucco, or masonry.

Installing secondary service entrances and porches that are incompatible in size and scale with the historic building or obscure, damage, or destroy character-defining features.

Masonry: Brick, stone, terra cotta, concrete, adobe, stucco, and mortar

Recommended:

Identifying, retaining, and preserving masonry features that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building such as walls, brackets, railings, cornices, window architraves, door pediments, steps, and columns; and joint and unit size, tooling and bonding patterns, coatings, and color.

Protecting and maintaining masonry by providing proper drainage so that water does not stand on flat, horizontal surfaces or accumulate in curved decorative features.

Cleaning masonry only when necessary to halt deterioration or remove heavy soiling.

Carrying out masonry surface cleaning tests after it has been determined that such cleaning is necessary. Tests should be observed over a sufficient period of time so that both the immediate effects and the long range effects are known to enable selection of the gentlest method possible.

Cleaning masonry surfaces with the gentlest method possible, such as low pressure water and detergents, using natural bristle brushes.

Inspecting painted masonry surfaces to determine whether repainting is necessary.

Removing damaged or deteriorated paint only to the next sound layer using the gentlest method possible (e.g., hand scraping) prior to repainting.

Applying compatible paint coating systems following proper surface preparation.

Repainting with colors that are historically appropriate to the building and district.

Evaluating the overall condition of the masonry to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, that is, if repairs to the masonry features will be necessary.

Repairing masonry walls and other masonry features by repointing the mortar joints where there is evidence of deterioration such as disintegrating mortar, cracks in mortar joints, loose bricks, damp walls, or damaged plasterwork.

Removing deteriorated mortar by carefully hand-raking the joints to avoid damaging the masonry.

Duplicating old mortar in strength, composition, color, and texture.

Duplicating old mortar joints in width and in joint profile.

Repairing stucco by removing the damaged material and patching with new stucco that duplicates the old in strength, composition, color, and texture.

Using mud plaster as a surface coating over unfired, unstabilized adobe because the mud plaster will bond to the adobe.

Repairing masonry features by patching, piecing-in, or consolidating the masonry using recognized preservation methods. Repair may also include the limited replacement in kind - or with compatible substitute material - of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of masonry features when there are surviving prototypes such as terra-cotta brackets or stone balusters.

Applying new or non-historic surface treatments such as water-repellent coatings to masonry only after repointing and only if masonry repairs have failed to arrest water penetration problems.

Replacing in kind an entire masonry feature that is too deteriorated to repair - if the overall form and detailing are still evident - using the physical evidence to guide the new work. Examples can include large sections of a wall, a cornice, balustrade, column, or stairway. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Designing and installing a new masonry feature such as steps or a door pediment when the historic feature is completely missing. It may be an accurate restoration using historical, pictorial, and physical documentation; or be a new design that is compatible with the size, scale, material, and color of the historic building.

Not Recommended:

Removing or radically changing masonry features which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.

Replacing or rebuilding a major portion of exterior masonry walls that could be repaired so that, as a result, the building is no longer historic and is essentially new construction.

Applying paint or other coatings such as stucco to masonry that has been historically unpainted or uncoated to create a new appearance.

Removing paint from historically painted masonry.

Radically changing the type of paint or coating or its color.

Failing to evaluate and treat the various causes of mortar joint deterioration such as leaking roofs or gutters, differential settlement of the building, capillary action, or extreme weather exposure.

Cleaning masonry surfaces when they are not heavily soiled to create a new appearance, thus needlessly introducing chemicals or moisture into historic materials.

Cleaning masonry surfaces without testing or without sufficient time for the testing results to be of value.

Sandblasting brick or stone surfaces using dry or wet grit or other abrasives. These methods of cleaning permanently erode the surface of the material and accelerate deterioration.

Using a cleaning method that involves water or liquid chemical solutions when there is any possibility of freezing temperatures.

Cleaning with chemical products that will damage masonry, such as using acid on limestone or marble, or leaving chemicals on masonry surfaces.

Applying high pressure water cleaning methods that will damage historic masonry and the mortar joints.

Removing paint that is firmly adhering to, and thus protecting, masonry surfaces.

Using methods of removing paint which are destructive to masonry, such as sandblasting, application of caustic solutions, or high pressure waterblasting.

Failing to follow manufacturers' product and application instructions when repainting masonry.

Using new paint colors that are inappropriate to the historic building and district.

Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the preservation of masonry features.

Removing non-deteriorated mortar from sound joints, then repointing the entire building to achieve a uniform appearance.

Using electric saws and hammers rather than hand tools to remove deteriorated mortar from joints prior to repointing.

Repointing with mortar of high portland cement content (unless it is the content of the historic mortar). This can often create a bond that is stronger than the historic material and can cause damage as a result of the differing coefficient of expansion and the differing porosity of the material and the mortar.

Repointing with a synthetic caulking compound.

Using a "scrub" coating technique to repoint instead of traditional repointing methods.

Changing the width or joint profile when repointing.

Removing sound stucco; or repairing with new stucco that is stronger than the historic material or does not convey the same visual appearance.

Applying cement stucco to unfired, unstabilized adobe. Because the cement stucco will not bond properly, moisture can become entrapped between materials, resulting in accelerated deterioration of the adobe.

Replacing an entire masonry feature such as a cornice or balustrade when repair of the masonry and limited replacement of deteriorated or missing parts are appropriate.

Using a substitute material for the replacement part that does not convey the visual appearance of the surviving parts of the masonry feature or that is physically or chemically incompatible.

Applying waterproof, water-repellent, or non-historic coatings such as stucco to masonry as a substitute for repointing and masonry repairs. Coatings are frequently unnecessary, expensive, and may change the appearance of historic masonry as well as accelerate its deterioration.

Removing a masonry feature that is unrepairable and not replacing it; or replacing it with a new feature that does not convey the same visual appearance.

Design for Missing Historic Features

Creating a false historical appearance because the replaced masonry feature is based on insufficient historical, pictorial, and physical documentation.

Introducing a new masonry feature that is incompatible in size, scale, material, and color.

STEVENS SQUARE HISTORIC DISTRICT GUIDELINES

II. Guidelines For Rehabilitation of Buildings

- A. Masonry Repair.
 - 1. No exterior sandblasting is permitted.
 - 2. Chemical cleaning is not permitted on glazed brick or terra-cotta, limestone, marble, or other masonry material susceptible to damage from chemical exposure.
 - 3. Repointing of joints shall be done with a mortar design similar to the original. Joints shall be tooled to match original profile.

- B. Window Replacement/Repair.
 - 1. Windows shall have clear glass unless historical documentation is presented which shows patterned or opaque glass.
 - 2. Anodized aluminum finished are not permitted.
 - 3. Mullion patterns will match original. Replacement windows shall replicate original window operation.
 - 4. Exterior windows should not be blocked or obscured from the interior. Exceptions may be granted for windows on secondary facades if a special case can be made for the necessity of such an alteration.

- C. Wood trim and siding.
 - 1. All exterior wood shall be painted, including decks, unless historical documentation demonstrates otherwise.

2. Deteriorated wood siding shall be replaced with wood siding. Aluminum, vinyl, and other synthetic siding will not be allowed.

E. Removal of historic fabric.

Selective removal of original building materials are allowed when deterioration has occurred or for remodeling as part of an adaptive use. HPC approval is required for any removal of historic building materials.

I. FINDINGS:

1. 1801 1st Avenue South is a contributing structure to the Steven's Square Historic District
2. The Steven's Square Historic District is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and is a locally designated historic district.
3. The applicant proposes to replace all of the windows on the top three stories and some windows on the basement level. These windows are non-original windows. The proposed metal panning does not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.
4. The applicant proposes to replace the window sills on the south and east elevations. As proposed, the replacement work does not meet the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

J. STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends that the HPC adopt staff findings and **approve** a Certificate of Appropriateness for the window replacement and exterior work with the following conditions.

1. CPED-Planning review and approve final site plan, floor plans, and elevations including paint color samples and material samples for the replacement brick.
2. Sash replacement is allowed for the windows if it meets the following conditions.
 - New sash shall have same profile as existing window;
 - Windows shall be aluminum clad or wood double-hung windows;
 - Windows shall have a true divided light pattern, not a simulated divided light pattern as proposed.
 - Metal panning of the windows shall not be allowed.
3. The replacement of the window sills on the south and east elevation shall be of rowlock brick to match the design of the original sills and shall not be cast stone.

4. The proposed fiber cement siding on the rear door surround shall not be allowed.
5. The proposed rear entry deck, stairs and proposed pickets shall be painted, not exposed wood.
6. The mortar work shall match the original in composition, color, texture, and hardness.
7. All of the proposed work shall comply with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

K. APPENDIX:

1. Map of Stevens Square Historic District
2. Scope of Work for Project
3. Plans for Rehabilitation
4. Pictures of Subject Structure
5. 1926 3rd Avenue South Replacement Window Comparison