

**CITY OF ALLENTOWN  
HISTORICAL ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
FINAL REVIEW SHEET  
AUGUST 29, 2016**

**Case #HDC-2016-0016** – Proposal to maintain shed constructed in rear of property

**Property located at:** 1613 W Linden Street  
**Historic District:** West Park  
**Case #HDC-2016-00016**  
**Meeting date:** August 29, 2016

**Property Owner:** Coriolano Vizcaino  
**Address:** 1613 W. Linden Street,  
Allentown PA 18102  
**Applicant:**  
**Applicant's Address:** same

**Building description, period, style, defining features:** This structure is a 3 story, 2 bay semi-detached orange brick dwelling with a larger roof dormer with triple 9 over 1 double hung windows, a second floor oriel windows, full front porch, and triple window with leaded glass on the first floor. The rear of the site has a garage and fenced side yard. The house dates from c. 1913 and is Colonial Revival in style. The house is next to West Park.

**Note:** This property was subdivided from 1615 W. Linden St. on August 13, 2007; a minor subdivision with file number 28-04.



**Proposed alterations:** It is proposed to maintain shed constructed in rear of property.

**Staff Approvals:** n/a

**Background:** HARB Case No. 02-WP-3, a Certificate of Appropriateness was issued to 1. Replace railing above side porch with white wrought iron fencing 40" high; 2. Replace railing above 1615 W. Linden Street garage with white wrought iron fencing to match porch 40" high; and 3. Install a new temporary 3 rail cedar fence at property line/West Park, until the arborvitae grows in, at which time the fence will be removed.

HARB Case #09-WP-7 heard on 10/5/09 – requiring that exterior muntins to match twin house to be installed on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor windows, HARB denied the request of existing interior muntins. The community & economic committee of City Council heard the case on 10/21/09 and City Council upheld the denial.



**Violations:** 8/8/16 – NOV - Shed constructed in rear yard.

9/16/09 – Replaced patio doors & 9/1 sash windows 3<sup>rd</sup> floor – vinyl (see case 09-WP-7)

8/8/11 – NOV mailed; Replaced three (3), 9 light over 1 light windows on the 3<sup>rd</sup> floor with three (3) 6 light over 6 light windows with interior muntins (denied at HARB mtg of 10/6/09); 10/26/11

– NOV non-compliance; 11/29/11 – FNOV non-compliance

**Guideline Citation: SIS 9.** New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. **Allentown Guidelines for Historic Districts:** 6. Guidelines for Additions in Historic Districts

**Evaluation, effect on historic district, recommendations:** The constructed shed is not highly visible since the property's rear sits at the end of an alleyway. The shed should be painted to match the color scheme of the house. The design of the door is also not ideal (shouldn't have muntins), however because it faces inward towards the yard, it doesn't impact the visible historic integrity. Does this structure exceed maximum buildable lot allowances?

**Discussion:** The discussion of the case focused on the level of visibility and details of the rear shed. The HARB agreed that the shed was not highly visible and only visible behind a fence constructed along the dead-end alley. The applicant showed the HARB a photograph of the shed painted to match the colors on the house and rear garage. It was also determined that the "man door" was not visible from any public right-of-way.

The applicants suggested the HARB create a "welcoming committee". His father does not speak English well and he did not understand that he was in an historic district and what that meant in terms of work he wanted to do. He thought such a "Welcoming Committee" would help new buyers understand the review process and take some of the fear out of the required review.

**Motion:** The HARB upon motion by Mr. Sell and seconded by Ms. Roberts adopted the proposal that City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work described herein:

1. The proposal to maintain the shed constructed at the rear of the property at 1613 W Linden Street was presented by Coriolano Vizcaino and son.
2. The shed as constructed is historically appropriate.
3. The shed is not highly visible from the public right-of-way and was painted to match the house and rear fence.
4. The shed was approved as submitted and as built.
5. The proposal to recommend a COA was unanimously approved. (5-0; motion carried; *Brobst, Fillman, Jackson, Roberts, Sell*)



**CITY OF ALLENTOWN  
HISTORICAL ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
FINAL REVIEW SHEET  
AUGUST 29, 2016**

**Case #HDC-2016-0017**– Proposal to construct a garage in rear of property

**Property located at:** 952 Oak Street  
**Historic District:** Old Allentown  
**Case #HDC-2016-00017**  
**Meeting date:** August 29, 2016

**Property Owner:** Brock Kline  
**Address:** 952 Oak Street, Allentown PA  
18102  
**Applicant:** same  
**Applicant's Address:** same

**Building description, period, style, defining features:** This structure is a 2 story 2 bay attached row house with gable roof, single roof dormer, 1 over 1 double hung windows, a grocer alley and white brick/stone façade. The rear of the property is currently fenced and used for parking. The house dates from c 1885 and is Federal revival in style. Many single level garages are located on the rear alley.



**Proposed alterations:** It is proposed to install a garage. The proposed garage is a one car garage 12' wide x 20' deep. Siding and roofing will be metal with a roll-up door with one row of 3 lights.

**Staff Approvals:** 7/29/14-HDA-2014-00056- Install a wooden picket fence in the rear perimeter of the yard.

**Background:**

**Violations:** n/a

**Guideline Citation:** **SIS 9.** New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials that characterize the property. The new work shall be compatible with the massing, size, scale, and architectural features to protect the historic integrity of the property and its environment. **Allentown Guidelines for Historic Districts:** 6. Guidelines for Additions in Historic Districts

**Evaluation, effect on historic district, recommendations:** The proposed structure is historically acceptable in concept given that several other similar styled garages exist within the alleyway. The location relative to the alley and back of the house should be determined. Will it be close to the alley similar to other garages on the alley? It is recommended that the roll-up door be paneled. It is recommended that the door facing the yard not have any muntins in the glass.



**Discussion:** The discussion focused on the style of garage door, the metal siding, and the color for the siding. The applicant's designer said there would be no problem using a paneled garage door, and the owners of the property agreed. There was some concern that the metal siding would be too industrial, but the Historic Consultant said she had seen it used in historic districts and it was surprisingly appropriate in appearance. Mr. Fillman also mentioned that he had seen it used in the historic district and agreed that it would be appropriate. The colors of the siding and roofing were reviewed.

**Motion:** The HARB upon motion by Mr. Fillman and seconded by Mr. Brobst adopted the proposal that City Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work described herein:

1. The proposal to install a garage at 952 Oak Street was presented by Denise Redcay, Brock Kline and Chris King.
2. The new garage will be for a single car garage and measure 12' wide x 20' deep.
3. Siding and roofing will be metal as proposed.
4. The roll-up garage door will be paneled and have one row of windows. The color of the garage door should blend with the other colors of the garage and should not be white.
5. The metal siding will be charcoal in color and the roof will be red.
6. The proposal to recommend a COA was unanimously approved. (5-0; motion carried; *Brobst, Fillman, Jackson, Roberts, Sell*)