

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

**Arlene Matzkin, Chair
Commission Conference Room
Suite 1301, 1401 Arch Street
29 April 1997**

Present

Arlene Matzkin, Chairperson
Tony Atkin
Penelope Batcheler
J. William Cornell
Herbert Levy
Daniel McCoubrey
Suzanne Pentz

Richard Tyler, Historic Preservation Officer
Randal Baron, Assistant Historic Preservation Officer
Laura Spina, Historic Preservation Specialist

Also

Sandra Kelly, Liberty Museum
Mr. Ujfalusi, Quaker City Restoration
Douglas Grainge, Liberty Museum
S. O'Rourke, Kass & Associates
T. Lyons Bradley, Undine Barge Club
J.J. Bird, Russell Roofing
John Carr, Conservator
Mark Thompson, Architect
Siraik Zakarian, 2201 Green Street
Don Friday
Lenore Millhollen, Center City Residents Association (C.C.R.A.)
Margaret MacLaren, C.C.R.A.
Michael Greenblatt, Canus Corporation
Jack Thrower, Bower Lewis Thrower Associates
Bill Burke, Art Commission
Susan Orna, for Benjamin Lifsey
David J. Hedge, Omnipoint Communications
Phil Jordan, Phillip Jordan Architects
Andres J Falotico, Omnipoint/Teleworx
Vern Lei, T.C. Lei Architects
Keith Barket, 1813 Delancey Street
Tim McDonald
Fernando Becattini Jr., The Bagel Factory
Mark Ansley, 1928 Pine Street
Peter Miller, 1928 Pine Street
Elisabeth Mistle, Philip Street
Paul Wilkenson, Whalen Co.
Judith Block, 219 Delancey Street
Bernice Hamel, 302 S. 2nd Street
Joyce Cole, 222 Delancey Street
Sybille Zeldin, 200 Delancey Street
Hope Broker, 200 Locust Street
Lynn Abraham, 213 Delancey Street
Mary Reinicke, 318 S. 2nd Street

Sandra Williams, 309 S. Philip Street
Lexie Brockway, 130 Spruce Street
L.H. Potamkin, 308 S. Front Street
Robert J. Shusterman, Esq.
Hugh Newell Jacobsen, Architect for 217 Delancey
Tina R. Makouljian, Ballard Spahr Andrews & Ingersoll
P.E. Rakita, 222 Delancey Street
E.A. Armour, 222 Delancey Street
Thomas P. Williams, 309 S. Philip Street
Alfred Zernik, 239 Spruce Street
Peter A. Horthy, 236-8 Delancey Street
Gene Davidoff, 210 Delancey Street
Cynthia J. Eiseman, 314 S. Philip Street
James Eiseman Jr., 314 Philip Street
Mary Margaret Losty, 218 Delancey Street

Ms. Matzkin called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m.

321 Chestnut Street

Liberty Museum, Owner
Sandra Kelly, Applicant
DATE: c. 1900, floor added c. 1915
PROPOSAL: New steps, windows, signage

This proposal involves modifications to alterations seen last month as well as a series of other changes to adapt the building to museum use. The list of changes included:

1. Remove first floor casement windows and install a new single pane window set forward in its opening.
2. Install a lighted sign box with a continuously changing L.E.D. message.
3. Remove the brick infill on the side of the building and install a new single pane window.
4. Modify the design of the new semi-circular steps to provide for a larger landing at the top.
5. Install bronze handrails on the sides of the steps.
6. Install bronze information plaques to the side of the steps.
7. Relocate siamese fire connections.
8. Install two banners on the front of the building and one at the corner.
9. New lighting for the facade.

The Committee members agreed with all aspects of the proposal except for the following: They thought that the new window should be set in the plane of the existing window even though this would not allow room on the inside for the internal sign box. They thought that the banner at the corner could do damage to the marble and should be placed on a brick pier on Orianna Street. Everyone agreed that the applicant should return with information on fixtures and attachment to allow for a review of lighting. It was noted that these proposals should be shown to the Park Service because of special regulations in effect in the zone adjacent to Independence National Historical Park.

The Committee voted to recommend approval for all of the proposals except for the lighting with the condition that the new windows be set in the plane of the existing, and that the corner banner be relocated to Orianna Street.

810 South Front Street

Don Flynn, Owner

Sean O'Rourke, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1795

PROPOSAL: Facade rehabilitation, rear addition

The applicant has proposed a complete rehabilitation of the old front building and a new addition on the rear. The work will include new windows, door, roof, cornice and extensive brick work repair. Committee members asked for a revision of the cornice molding and Mrs. Batcheler sketched a detail.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to review specifications and the resubmitted cornice detail.

2325 Spruce Street

Sal Dell'Orefice, Owner

David Ujfalusi, Quaker City Brick & Stone Restoration/Applicant

DATE: c.1860

PROPOSAL: Stone facade restoration

This proposal involves restoring the Serpentine stone facade of this rowhouse. The stone, with its stucco now removed for safety reasons, will be repointed. Some stones will be replaced with real Serpentine and others will be patched. The masons propose placing weep tubes in the stone to let out moisture. The stone will receive a waterproof, though vapor permeable, coating.

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

500 West Willow Grove Avenue, Chestnut Hill Academy

Mark Thompson, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1882-4

PROPOSAL: Porch rehabilitation

The applicant seeks to install a wood lattice and turned spindle porch based on what once existed on this Victorian school. The current porch, modernized before the designation of the building, will receive restored railings now, but the rebuilding of the concrete deck awaits a later phase. Pending the deck rebuilding phase, the architect plans to retain vertical supports from the existing metal railing.

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

2015 Spruce Street

Ken Balin, Owner
Ernest Copson Jr/Applicant
DATE: c.1855
PROPOSAL: Re-roof mansard

This proposal calls for removing the metal replacement roof and installing GAF Slateline asphalt shingles. The adjacent neighboring structure has asphalt shingles although most of the row still has slate.

Based on the principle that the historic material has been removed and the shingles better approximate the look of the original roof than the metal, the Committee voted to recommend approval.

2214 St. James Street

Lori Clark, Owner/Applicant
John Carr, Conservator
DATE: 1860
PROPOSAL: stone cleaning and pointing

This proposal calls for cleaning, resetting and repointing the stone facade of this townhouse. Testing and samples will be provided for staff to review and approve.

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

4414 Ridge Avenue, Undine Barge Club

T. Lyons Bradley, Owner/Applicant
DATE: boat club 1875, stone house c.1840
PROPOSAL: demolition

This proposal calls for demolishing a badly decayed stone farmhouse at the rear of the boathouse property. The Furness and Hewitt Barge Club faces Kelly Drive; the deteriorated farmhouse fronts Ridge Avenue. The Club looked into renovating the house and found it would cost in the range of \$150,000 because it needs substantial rehabilitation, including a new floor structure and roof. Mr. Tyler explained that the nomination of the boathouse to the Philadelphia Register does not mention this stone farmhouse. He thought that, given its distance from the Furness and Hewitt designed boathouse, the Commission did not intend to designate this structure. Some Committee members thought it would be wise to document the structure with 8x10 black and white photographs and that any calculations the boat club members made about the cost of restoration should be forwarded in a letter.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the demolition with photographic documentation of the house.

2201-2205 Green Street

Siraik Zakarian, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1890

PROPOSAL: stone fence replacement

This proposal calls for an alteration in the material used in the rebuilding of the fence-wall approved at the last Commission meeting. The brownstone wall now appears irreparable and the cost of replacement in brownstone prohibitive. IN view of these circumstances, Ms. Zakarian seeks permission to rebuild the portion of the fence surrounding the gate in cinderblock with scored brown stucco. Also she seeks to build a fence in the same material along the north line of her property.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff review of a stucco sample.

35 South 3rd Street

Yu Xiang Peng, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1855

PROPOSAL: Repaint facade

This proposal calls for repainting the cast iron facade "dove white" with gray for the fire escape and cornice.

The Committee voted to recommend approval but recommended darker shades of the same colors.

1835 Spruce Street

Don Friday, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1860

PROPOSAL: Brownstone restoration

This proposal calls for patching/repairing the brownstone watertable and steps of this rowhouse. The mason suggests "Mimic" for the watertable and Thoro Coat and Seal for the steps.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff review of a sample.

1315 Lombard Street

Joshua Barol, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1840

PROPOSAL: legalize screen door, transom storm window, basement windows and removal of basement grate.

This proposal calls for legalizing several areas of work completed without a permit. Mr. Barol had his basement windows replaced with vinyl sliders because the old ones had rotted. When the frames were removed one of the basement metal grates was also removed but it still exists in his basement. The front door currently has a metal and glass storm door and the transom has a

storm window, neither of which received Commission approval. Mr. Barol says the storm door and transom storm window existed when he purchased the property. He now seeks to replace the door with a full glass type that reveals more of the front door. He would like to retain the transom storm window.

The Committee voted to recommend denial. They recommended that the three pane true muntin basement windows and bars be reinstalled and that the storm door and transom storm be removed.

1401 East Bristol Street, Carl Mackley Apartments

Canus Corporation, Owner

Roderick Wolfson, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1933-4

PROPOSAL: Complete rehabilitation; new windows, enclose balconies, proposal in concept

This proposal, in concept, calls for completely renovating this landmark housing complex of Bauhaus International Style design. The exterior changes involve removing the recently installed double hung sash and installing new slider windows that will have the same vertical divisions as the original casements. The masonry units will need to be restored; the open porches will be glazed to provide more interior space, and several doors will need widening to provide handicapped accessible units.

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

115 Elfreth's Alley

Phillip Beltz, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c.1792

PROPOSAL: pent over back door

This proposal calls for rebuilding a deteriorated pent over a rear door in matching materials.

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

330 South 12th Street

Carmen Pirollo, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1828

PROPOSAL: repair chimney, rebuild cellar doors

Mr. Pirollo seeks to repair his deteriorated chimney with new brick and smooth stucco. The cellar doors will be reconstructed in wood to match the existing, utilizing the existing iron hinges.

The Committee voted to recommend approval with staff to approve details.

1801 Vine Street, Family Court Building

Ervin Davis/Court Administrator/Applicant

DATE: 1939

PROPOSAL: Tree removal

This proposal calls for the removal of the trees around the perimeter of the court building. Both the landscape architect working on a landscape plan for the site and Amy Freitag of the Fairmount Park Commission thought that the trees that have grown up are neither original nor beneficial to the design or maintenance of the building. Several of the main trees are half dead wood leading the Administrative Judge to seek their removal.

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

122 South 18th Street

Maribel Leroux, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1898

PROPOSAL: Awnings

This proposal calls for an awning over the pastry shop window to protect the chocolates from melting and a canopy on brass legs to extend out from the door to the curb. Ms. Leroux explained that she keeps the door open even in the winter because it is heavy and she has an internal vestibule door. She claims that the weather has damaged the finish on the door during the course of the past winter alone.

Committee members found the awning design for the window acceptable, but thought that the door canopy hid too much of the architecture of the transom area. They said that the damage to the door probably resulted from the fact that it had been cut, leaving the end grain exposed. They recommended flashing the top of the door with a strip of copper and a good coating for the faces of the door. Mr. Burke from the Art Commission explained that his Commission does not approve of the canopy type of awning extending across the sidewalk in any case.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the window awning, adjusted to meet zoning code dimension requirements, and denial of the door canopy.

272 South 23rd Street

Benjamin Lifsey, Owner/Applicant

DATE: c. 1895

PROPOSAL: Legalize windows

Mr. Baron explained that one weekend, without a permit, the owner replaced the curved windows on the third floor of the corner turret with flat, vinyl one-over-one windows. The original windows, still extant on the second floor, have Victorian sash with the upper sash one third the size of the overall window. Susan Orna, representing the owner, stated that

the owner heard that the Commission was considering the designation of the district, but did not know that the designation occurred. Mr. Baron showed the letter of notification of the designation, which the Commission sent to Mr. Lifsey on 4 August 1995, which explained the jurisdiction of the Commission and that any work, including new windows, requires Commission approval.

Ms. Orna then stated that the deteriorated state of the window sash forced the owner to replace them with new windows. She noted that the owner still has the original glass and has received bids to repair the sash and frames. The bids proved cost prohibitive and he installed the new windows. Mr. Baron noted that the bids from contractors to repair the sash ranged widely in price. The Committee emphasized that the Committee and Commission should have reviewed the proposal before the owner performed any work. If the cost of the repair of the windows proves too large a burden, the Commission has a financial hardship committee; however, this, too, should have been explored before the owner performed any work.

The new windows do not replicate the original shape or placement of the meeting rail. These differences proved too great for the Committee to accept.

The Committee voted to recommend denial. The original sash should be repaired and reinstalled or new windows made to match the originals.

315 North Broad Street, Packard Building

Packard Historic Association, Owner

Vern Lei, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1910-1911

PROPOSAL: Antennae

Vern Lei, architect, presented the proposal for antennae on the penthouse of the building. The Committee objected to the mounting of the antennae in front of the cornice of the penthouse. Mr. Lei stated that the antennae could be attached below the cornice instead. The Committee emphasized that the company must paint out the equipment to match the background building and remove all equipment when it becomes obsolete.

The Committee voted to recommend approval of the antennae mounted to the penthouse below the cornice on the conditions that the company paints out the equipment to match the building and removes all equipment when it becomes obsolete.

1925-1927 Walnut Street AKA 135 South 20th Street, The Chatham

Michael Singer Real Estate, Owner

Vern Lei, Architect/Applicant

DATE: c. 1927

PROPOSAL: Antennae

Vern Lei, architect, presented the proposal for antennae on the roof of this gothic-revival building. The proposal includes having support structures built at three corners of the building with antennae attached to them. The total height of the structures would measure thirteen feet. Ms. Matzkin objected to the thirteen-foot projection of the antennae so close to the edge of the front and side facades. She noted that, although the owner removed the slender finials which topped the ornamented facades before the designation of the building, the building still has a large amount of decoration at the roofline. The antennae would have a very negative impact on these visual elements.

Ms. Matzkin suggested moving the antennae towards the center of the building to reduce their visibility. Andres Falotico, a representative of Omnipoint, stated that the antennae may be able to function if at the center of the roof, closer to the penthouse; however, the antennae would then have to be larger than the proposed thirteen feet. The company would have to investigate. The Committee discussed the possibility of having the antennae built to mimic the former finials, actually becoming part of the building's decoration. Mr. Falotico stated that the idea would prove infeasible. The Committee objected to the overall design, especially the height of the antennae, and suggested that the company seek another site in the area.

Six members of the Committee voted to recommend denial of the proposal. Mr. Cornell dissented.

510 Walnut Street, Penn Mutual Life Insurance Co. Building

The Bagel Factory Management Company, Tenant

Phillip Jordan, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1839 - Egyptian Revival facade; c. 1970

PROPOSAL: Awning

Phillip Jordan, architect, described the proposal for an awning over the doors on the east facade of the building. The Commission approved the installation of the doors in December 1996. The Committee discussed the proposed sign over the gate; however, since the gate does not sit on a designated property, the Committee could only advise the applicant to attach the signage to the side of the gate rather than at the top.

The Committee voted to recommend approval. Mr. Cornell abstained.

1813 Delancey Street

Keith Barket, Owner

Kathryn Walker, Applicant

DATE: c. 1856

PROPOSAL: Partial rear demolition, rear deck, new garage entrance

Keith Barket, owner, wishes to alter several elements at the

rear of the property, including removing the fifth-floor, non-historic, metal and glass enclosure; building a roof deck and installing a garage door on the first floor with a second deck above at the second floor. The Committee did not object to the plans in concept, but did object to the materials proposed. The plans showed the new exterior wall, required by the removal of the metal and glass enclosure, on the fifth floor and all of the deck railings as solid sheets of cedar plywood. The Committee noted that plywood as a wall material does not meet the code requirements for fire and structural safety. As a material, plywood does not withstand weathering and tends to delaminate. The Committee also agreed that plywood would not be a compatible material for a wall surface on an historic house. Mr. Barket stated that he would consult with his architect about the wall and railing details, but he asked if the Committee and Commission would give a conditional approval so that he could move ahead with the exterior work. The Committee agreed that one possible way to proceed would be to have the architect show a picket railing for the decks and stucco for the rear, fifth-story wall with staff to approve details. This option allows Mr. Barket to receive a permit. He will return to the Committee and Commission next month with a revised design.

The Committee voted to recommend approve the garage and first floor alterations and the other alterations on the condition that the proposed alterations are changed to a stucco wall on the rear fifth-floor and wooden picket railings on the decks with staff to approve details.

126 Market Street

Timothy McDonald, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1840

PROPOSAL: Facade rehabilitation, new windows

Timothy McDonald wishes to rehabilitate the front facade. The proposal includes replacing in-kind the wood windows and cleaning the facade. Mr. McDonald also wishes to perform investigative demolition on the first floor, hoping the original storefront remains underneath. After his investigation, he will return with a formal storefront proposal.

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

1928 Pine Street

Mark Ansley, Owner

Peter Miller, Applicant

DATE: 1888-1889

PROPOSAL: Alter garage

Peter Miller explained that the non-historic garage, a small, one-story structure at the rear of the property, faces Waverly Street. He wishes to widen the entire garage and change the flat roof to a gabled roof, with the gable facing east. The

roof would have asphalt/fiberglass shingles.

The Committee voted to recommend approval.

2127 St. James Street

Marion Rogel, Owner/Applicant

DATE: 1923

PROPOSAL: Awning

Marion Rogel, owner, wishes to install an awning over the first floor window which faces into English Village. Ms. Rogel, in her application, stated that an awning had previously existed. Mr. Tyler and Ms. Spina went to the site to investigate any evidence of a previous awning. The bricks and pointing around the window show no evidence. Ms. Rogel pointed to a single, small metal loop or "eye" mounted on a wooden plug in a mortar joint. She determined that the piece was part of an awning. Mr. Tyler and Ms. Spina disagreed. The piece, located at least one-and-one-half feet away from the window, is too far from the window to have been used as a part of an awning. Also, it is located along the wall exactly between the window and the downspout, suggesting that it may have been a mount for a flower pot or a flag. No other evidence along the entire facade suggests that the house had an awning and a cursory look at other houses along English Village failed to produce any evidence of awnings on any of the houses.

Mr. Tyler stated that many houses in the 1920s and 1930s had awnings. The Committee members, however, noted that many urban homes did not have awnings in that era. Besides the lack of evidence of awnings on any of the houses in English Village, the Committee was concerned that allowing an awning on this residence would set a precedent. In the past the only awnings approved by the Commission have been for commercial properties or, in the case of 2329 Spruce Street, for a door on a secondary facade.

The Committee's vote split with four against the proposal and three in favor. Mr. Atkin, Ms. Batcheler, Mr. Levy and Ms. Pentz voted against the awning.

7500 Germantown Avenue, New Covenant Church

Vern Lei, Architect/Applicant

DATE: 1890

PROPOSAL: Legalizing present installation of antennae

Mr. Baron explained that the Department of Licenses and Inspections issued a violation for the original Comcast antennae installation on the smokestack of this property because it deviated greatly from the approved plans. Vern Lei, architect, and two representatives from Comcast presented drawings of the existing conditions of the antennae on the top of the brick smokestack. Ms. Matzkin noted that the present conditions vary considerably from the drawings approved by the Commission two

years ago. The approved drawings show two antennae set into each niche while the existing conditions have four antennae units set protruding from each niche. The support structure extends above and below the two cornices, obscuring the architectural details.

Mr. Lei stated that, once installed, the contractor had to adjust the equipment so that it would work correctly. The Committee asked how the equipment had to be changed. The RF (radio frequency) technician explained that the antennae, as designed, proved too high above the area and had to be pushed outward and tilted downward so that the transmission signal would reach the ground. The Committee asked why the contractor placed the antennae so far apart and outside of the niches. The technician replied that the antennae are four feet long and must be placed at least two feet apart in order to function correctly. The Committee noted that the engineer understands the size and distance of the antennae before installation; the plans did not show those requirements, which the company understood even before construction took place.

The Committee asked Mr. Lei why the contractor did not follow the required plans to paint out the equipment and install a false brick cover over the cable tray. Mr. Lei stated that the material chosen to cover the cable tray proved too heavy for construction so the contractor did not install it. They now propose to install a fiberglass cover, constructed and colored to appear as brick.

The Committee stated that any deviation from the plans should have returned to the Committee and Commission for approval. The contractor changed too many items, including the size, placement, shape and color of the antennae, and the covering of the cable tray. The company could not build an antenna system any way it wanted and then return for approval simply because the work had already taken place. In the future, any proposed work that differs from the plans approved by the Committee and Commission must return for an additional approval.

The Committee voted to recommend denial.

217 Delancey Street

Stephen B. Klein, Owner

Hugh Newell Jacobsen, Architect

DATE: 1758

PROPOSAL: Partial demolition, new addition

This proposal reviewed and approved in concept now comes before the Committee for its final review. Mr. Jacobsen explained how he revised the drawings since the last Committee meeting. He showed that the sills on the dormers had been raised although they still sit flush on the front wall line to help differentiate this design from an actual Colonial house. The roof received some skylights which Mr. Jacobsen explained would

hardly be visible from the street. The primary change, however, involved breaking up the horizontal expanse of the Philip Street facade with some vertical slots meant to help the structures read as separate back buildings. Mr. Jacobsen showed a proposed brick, several shades darker than the brick of the original house.

Ms. Matzkin said that the current design followed the original approved concept rather closely. Ms. Batcheler offered that the neighbors have concerns about the width of the garage door on Philip Street which will be 23 feet wide. She asked if it could not be constructed with two separate doors divided by a pier or at least have applied molding that divided it visually into several pieces. The architect responded that an actual pier would not allow the necessary turning radius for two cars, but that he could look into the idea of applied molding.

A neighbor thought that the front of the building on Delancey Street looked overly massive and should be set back from the street line. She mentioned other modern houses on the street that set back, creating an area for sculpture or a garden. Committee members said that from an historical and design standpoint it was preferable to maintain the building line. Ms. Batcheler said that having the dormers set right on the front wall, rather than back on the roof, contributed to the massive quality. She also thought that the dark color might make the building stand out rather than recede. Everyone agreed that it would be helpful to look at a mock up brick panel to judge the color. Mr. Jacobsen said that he was trying to get a brick called Savannah Gray which he said would provide a subtle contrast but still fit in with the street.

Robert Shusterman, Esq., attorney for several of the neighbors on Philip Street, explained that the massiveness and length of the garage door and indeed the entire low linear side facade would have a brutal appearance on the pedestrian scale of Philip Street. Although the proposed garage is lower than the old, he said that the linear quality of the new design would break up the residential quality of the street.

Committee members responded that the new addition could be seen as less massive since it is lower and that the architect has broken up the linear quality by changing the roof of the new kitchen wing and by introducing greater articulation between the components of that wing. In addition, unlike the present garage, the proposed new one sits back three and one-half feet from the Philip Street property line.

Several neighbors expressed the opinion that the widened garage will damage the small scale character of Philip Street with its width, noise, and damage to the curb. Bernice Hamel on behalf of the Preservation Committee of the Society Hill Civic Association expressed her concern about the width of the garage and asked Mr. Klein if he had considered parking one of the two cars off site as do she and other neighbors.

Mr. Klein and his counsel Tina Makoulian, Esq., of Ballard, Spahr, Ingersoll, and Andrews responded that he purchased the property after having received conceptual approval from the Historical Commission and after having determined that the Zoning code allowed a two car garage. He explained that having experienced the late night ambience walking between his house and the parking garage on 3rd and South, he and the other person in the house would not have purchased this house without a two car garage. Ms. Makoulian explained that Mr. Klein has correctly proceeded with all approvals and that the neighbors and the Commission are estopped from altering the approval or raising new concerns that were not expressed at earlier meetings.

Neighbors, including Lynn Abraham and other immediately adjoining property owners, expressed concerns that there was not notice to neighbors about the consideration of this addition. Also several neighbors, including Mr. P.E. Rakita of 222 Delancey Street and Ms. Sybille Zeldin of 200 Delancey Street, said that this issue encompassed more than the letter of the law, but rather should address trying to work with neighbors to find a mutually agreeable solution to keep intact what is important in the design of the neighborhood.

Several other neighbors expressed their concern with the design and the system of the review process. Mr. Shusterman said that he thought the system lacked due process. Ms. Joyce Cole from 222 Delancey Street asked whether Flemish bond brickwork had been considered. Ms. Elizabeth Armour said that she thought the proposed building out of scale and the wrong color and that the delicate character of Delancey Street should be respected.

Staff members explained that they had provided notice of the meetings to the neighborhood association as well as anyone who had attended the previous review of this project and who had asked to be notified. Mr. Tyler himself notified several others by telephone. The Philadelphia Code, including the historic preservation ordinance, requires the posting of properties proposed for demolition, but it contains no provision for notice to neighbors of the reviews associated with the issuance of building permits. Ms. Spina clearly stated that the Commission would further consider this application at the public meeting of May 14, 1997 in the City Council Caucus Room.

Mr. Klein explained that he had met with neighbors to discuss the plan although no agreement was reached on the issue of door width. Messrs. Tyler and Levy explained that they thought the architect had responded to the input of the neighbors and the Committee with design changes. They agreed that the design should respect the street but also be a product of 1997.

The Committee unanimously voted to recommend approval with the brick color, pointing sample and final garage door design to be reviewed by Committee and staff.

Respectfully submitted,
Randal Baron & Laura M. Spina