



CITY OF ALLENTOWN

30206

RESOLUTION

R69 – 2021

Introduced by the Administration on May 19, 2021

Certificates of Appropriateness for work in the Historic Districts: 337 N. 8th St., 23 N. West St. and 1507 W. Turner St.

Resolved by the Council of the City of Allentown, That

WHEREAS, Certificates of Appropriateness are required under the provisions of the Act of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania No. 167, June 13, 1961 (P.L. 282) and City of Allentown Ordinance No. 12314; and

WHEREAS, the following properties, whose respective owners applied for and were granted approval by the Allentown Historic Architectural Review Board (HARB) to undertake specific exterior alterations on said properties as indicated in the attached Final Review Reports, which form part of this resolution:

- 337 N. 8th St.
Christina Nemes
- 23 N. West St.
Shantay McPherson
- 1507 W. Turner St.
Stephanie Kocher.

WHEREAS, on May 3, 2021, the Allentown HARB recommended approval of the above applications, or offered modifications which were subsequently accepted by the property owners, to City Council; and

WHEREAS, after reviewing the attached final review reports, it is the opinion of City Council that the proposed work is appropriate.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Allentown that Certificates of Appropriateness are hereby granted for the above referenced work.

	Yea	Nay
Candida Affa	X	
Ce-Ce Gerlach	X	
Daryl Hendricks	X	
Cynthia Mota	X	
Joshua Siegel	X	
Ed Zucal	X	
Julio A. Guridy, President	X	
TOTAL	7	0

THIS IS TO CERTIFY, That the above copy of Resolution No. 30206 was adopted by the City Council of Allentown on the 19th day of May, 2021, and is on file in the City Clerk's Office.



 City Clerk

**HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA
May 3, 2021
FINAL REVIEW**

Case # HDC-2021-00015

Property Address: 1507W. Turner St

Proposal: Partial reconstruction of existing front porch including new roof, additional support columns and replacement of rotted modillions.

Historic District: West Park

Property Owner/Applicant: Stephanie Kocher

Building description, period, style defining features:

This brick 3-story end of row house, ca 1911 is a Colonial Revival. The mansard roof has red slate shingles, a large dormer with 8/2 sash window, projecting cornice and spire roof with a finial. The 2nd floor has a projecting cornice with brackets and a bay window with 1/1 sash windows, glass transom and a wooden keystone over the windows. The 1st floor has a picture windows with beveled glass transom and brick lintels. The wooden porch has a single beveled glass door, transom, and projecting moldings as well as wrought iron columns and railing and bull-nosed concrete steps and wrought iron railings. There is a visible basement window grille. The rear of the property has a wooden fence and gate with porches; the 1st floor is enclosed with siding and the 2nd porch has square columns, wrought iron railing and a door.



Proposed Alterations:

1. Partial reconstruction of existing front porch including new roof, additional support columns and recapping of rotted portions of dentil molding.

The proposed scope of work at the porch support columns is not appropriate as proposed. There is insufficient information in the application to fully evaluate the proposed alterations and materials.

As proposed, one non-historic metal support (at center) will remain; one non-historic metal support (at corner) will be replaced with a 6x6 post; and the one wood half pillar (at the shared entrance) will be removed and replaced with a full-height 6x6 post. The 6x6 posts will be “padded out to receive new PVC material to finish off the posts.” PVC cladding is not an appropriate material. There is no information about the finished appearance, shape, or size of the new columns. Removal of the existing wood half column is not justified. Removal of historic material should be avoided whenever possible. Installation of a new (half) column at the shared entrance will change the appearance of the building. There is precedent for a shared column within this block of houses. A shared column may have existed originally. However, the shared columns are *all* half columns supported by a base integrated with the shared railing.

It is not appropriate or recommended to cover the new exterior beam or the fascia with PVC product. As proposed, the “existing dentil pieces will be removed and recapped.” The dentil modillions should be retained and repaired or replaced like-for-like with wood to match existing. Dentil modillions should not be capped.

Replacement of the deteriorated porch ceiling with new triple 2” beaded soffit to replicate existing is appropriate. Applicant to confirm that proposed new soffit material is wood. The proposed re-roofing does not appear to be visible from the street. The proposed EPDM rubber roofing over insulation board, aluminum drip edge and aluminum downspout (white to match existing trim) is acceptable.

Historic District Impact:

As proposed, the alterations to the porch supports columns will negatively impact the surrounding historic district. The subject building is the end of a long block of attached houses. This block is united visually by a continuous row of front porches with similar wood columns, railings, and pediments above the shared entrances. The proposed changes will not fully reverse the inappropriate metal supports and will result in the removal or inappropriate of original porch features. Replacement of the two non-original metal columns with appropriate columns would benefit the surrounding district.

HARB Discussion

The application as presented does not appropriately address the historic architectural fabric of the front porch. The HARB expressed their concerns to the owner that the proposed scope of work to leave the metal vertical supports in place. The applicant expressed her position that she

was not intending to replace the metal vertical supports as part of the scope of work but rather add additional wood 6 x 6 posts. This brought up the topic of the structural stability of the roof which the HARB recommended be assessed by a professional engineer to make the determination. If the structure is determined to be acceptable to support the existing roof loads, then the metal supports can remain, if it is determined that additional structural supports are required then all metal members must be replaced with new round wood columns to match the extant column on the porch and the adjoining houses in the row lining the street.

The use of 6 x 6 wood posts and PVC to cap existing wood details and trim are not appropriate nor acceptable. The applicant was encouraged by the HARB to replace the roof as proposed with a roll down rubber roof, replace the downspout with a round one, replace deteriorated or missing wood details with new to wood to match existing.

Recommendation(s):

The recommended scope of work is full replacement of all inappropriate metal elements with new supports to match the extant tapered round columns at the adjoining buildings should the determination by a structural engineer determine the need for additional support. Porch details—including the fascia and dentil modillions—should be repaired or replaced like-for-like and no elements shall be capped with PVC. It is recommended that the applicant submit drawings, graphic representations of the scope of work, and product data for proposed materials. The recommendation is to advise applicant on the appropriate scope of work and not approve the application as submitted.

Action

Motion to approve the application as per the above recommendations was made by HARB member Shane Fillman, motion was seconded by HARB member Ellen Roberts Motion carried with unanimous support.

**HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA
May 3, 2021
FINAL REVIEW**

Case # HDC-2021-00013

Property Address: 337 N. 8th St.

Proposal: New handrail on one side of front steps and new full view, single pane storm door for rear entrance

Historic District: Old Allentown

Property Owner/Applicant: Christina Nemes

Building description, period, style defining features:

This 2½-story painted brick Federal/Victorian row house with Italianate influences, ca 1875 is in excellent condition. The gable roof has asphalt shingles with snow catchers, a bullet dormer, denticulated cornice and a single chimney.

The windows are 2/2 sash with Italianate eyebrow lintels on the 2nd floor and the 1st floor has 3 windows with flat lintels and stained-glass transoms displaying tulips. The main entry has a stoop with a single door that has a transom; there is a projecting molding that spans the top of the door and the large set of windows. There are projected moldings that frame the door and windows on the 1st floor. There is a slatted grocer's alley door with a stained-glass transom with a flat lintel and basement window grille.



Proposed Alterations:

1. Installation of new handrail on one side of existing stoop.
2. Installation of new full light storm door for rear entry door.

Evaluation of Proposed Project:

The proposed installation of a new handrail is appropriate and will not impact the building's architectural character. Based on the submitted photograph and material description as wrought iron, the simple metal railing is appropriate for a building of this style and period. The applicant is encouraged to submit more specific product data or manufacturer information about the proposed railing to be used. The proposed railing is compliant with the Design Guidelines' general stoops and steps section.

The application does not specify the side of the stoop on which the handrail will be installed. The existing stone steps do not appear to have holes or physical evidence of a prior railing and the 2013 county assessor photo does not show a prior railing. There is no known documentation of a part railing for the purpose of replication. It is recommended to install the handrail on the left side to be consistent with neighboring building 335 N. 8th Street and others on the block. However, installation on either side of the stoop would be appropriate and not impact the building's character.

The proposed installation of a new full light storm door at the rear entry is appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The rear entry door is only partially visible from the rear alley (N. Silk Street) and will not impact the building's architectural character. The full light storm door will have a minimal visual impact.

Historic District Impact:

The proposed project will not negatively impact the surrounding historic district. The attached rowhouses on this block of N. 8th Street have a dynamic mix of architectural detailing in similar, though not matching, styles. Most buildings on either side of the block have a single- or double-sided iron railing at the stoop. Many have simple narrow balusters, and a few have scroll details. The proposed new railing will blend with the surrounding buildings. The proposed storm door will be located on a rear façade and will not impact the district.

HARB Discussion

Board unanimously agreed the proposed handrail and full light storm door as proposed in location and photographs are appropriate.

Recommendation(s):

The proposed project is recommended to be approved as submitted with the recommendation that the new handrail be installed on the left side of the stoop. The applicant is encouraged to submit product data information sheets, drawings, or cut sheets for the proposed railing and door products for record-keeping purposes and to confirm that the installed products will match the supplied photographs.

Action

Motion to approve the application as submitted was made by HARB member Ellen Roberts, motion was seconded by HARB Chair David Huber. Motion carried with unanimous support.

**HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA**

**May 3, 2021
FINAL REVIEW**

Case # HDC-2021-00014

Property Address: 23 N. West St.

Proposal: Replacement of slate roof shingles with new slate shingles (or recommended alternative product) new flashing, new EPDM roofing for flat roof as well as replacement of wooden fascia with new vented aluminum soffit. New side entrance basement door to replace existing plywood "door".

Historic District: West Park

Property Owner/Applicant: Shantay McPherson

Building description, period, style defining features:

This three-story brick end of the row This 3-story brick/stucco single house, ca 1900 is a Colonial style. The flat roof has turret with slate shingles and a single chimney. There is an iron fence along the length of the brick porch which wraps around the west (front) and south (side) facades of the building. The windows are seventeen 6/6 sash, brick lintels and a bay window with transom. The main entry is a double door on a brick porch.



Proposed Alterations:

1. Replacement of existing plywood basement door with a salvaged wooden door.
2. Demolition of brick side porch and installation of new stairs to access existing French Doors. Alternatively, complete reconstruction of porch.
3. Replacement of slate shingles on the turret with new slate shingle and new flashing.
4. Replacement of flat roof material with new EPDM or Owens Corning Shingle.
5. Replacement of rotten wooden fascia with new wooden fascia and aluminum soffit.

Evaluation of Proposed Project:

Two treatments are proposed for the side porch: the first is demolition and construction of a new independent stair to the existing French doors on the side (secondary) façade; the second is demolition and reconstruction of the side porch. The brick side porch does not appear to be an original feature of the building. Sanborn map research indicates that the original configuration was a full-width wood front porch and no side porch; the brick side porch and possibly brick front porch base appears to have been installed after 1950. No historic photographs have been found.

Evaluation of the first proposal requires more information about the treatment of the building. The porch and railing are not original, nor significant features of the building and removal could be considered acceptable. The following questions should be answered:

1. Once the side porch is removed, what is the proposed treatment to the portion of the house that will be left exposed?
2. How will the front porch edge be terminated? Where is the dividing line between the side porch and the front porch?
3. Does the existing porch act as a retaining wall above the basement door? How will landscaping and any site or structural issues be addressed?
4. What are the proposed materials and design of the new side stairs?

Evaluation of the second proposal requires more information about the reconstruction. The following questions should be answered:

1. What are the materials to be used for the porch and railing?
2. What is the proposed design of the porch and railing? Is the current proposal based on an exact reconstruction of the existing porch?

Either scope of work will impact the historic building. The first proposal has the potential to return the building closer to its original appearance; however, there may be insufficient documentation existing about the building's original design to support this claim.

The new door proposed at the basement entrance is appropriate and is only partially visible from the street. The proposed use of a salvaged wood door is encouraged and appropriate.

Replacement will be a positive impact on the building and improvement over the existing plywood door.

The proposed roof work includes replacement of deteriorated slate at the turret roof, replacement of the low slope building roof, and in-kind replacement of the deteriorated wood fascia and installation of a vented aluminum soffit. The low slope roof work is acceptable and does not require HARB review on its own per the Guidelines. Replacement of deteriorated wood trim with wood is acceptable; the new fascia should match the original in size, profile, dimension, and appearance. Vented soffits are effective solutions for air and moisture circulation and can be minimally visible. The soffit should be painted to match the wood trim.

The Guidelines allow for the replacement of natural slate with composite slate products. The use of natural slate is generally recommended because it is a like-for-like replacement of historic materials and has a long lifespan. However, composite slate products are available that mimic natural slate and are less expensive. Composite slate products will deteriorate faster than natural slate and will have to be replaced sooner. Composite slates are thicker than asphalt-based 3-tab or architectural shingles and mimic the appearance of natural slate better. The key factors in slate

replacement are to match the original shingle size, shape, pattern, color, and exposure (the amount of each tile visible). The existing slate should be salvaged.

Historic District Impact:

The subject building is a corner building located on the southern boundary of the West Park Historic District. The proposed roof, slate, and trim work will not substantially alter the building's architectural character nor the character of the surrounding block. The proposed porch work will have an impact on the surrounding district. The first proposal will alter the building more, but as stated above, it has the potential to return the building to a more original appearance, which could be an overall positive impact to the district. The second proposal would retain the non-historic porch but can be considered a like-for-like replacement of a building feature that was (likely) intact when the district was designated.

HARB Discussion

Board unanimously agreed that the restorative approach to the porch reconstruction was appropriate and retained as much original historic fabric as possible and the proposed replication of the details for components that cannot be reused was acceptable. Board members suggested using a Slateline or three-tab shingle for the roofing and the owner/applicant was receptive to this suggestion. The owner asked for guidance on paint colors and was referred to the Old Allentown Historic Preservation Association for recommended, historically appropriate colors. It was also discussed and agreed that painting the color to match the existing porch color was appropriate and in keeping with the existing colors of the house trim.

Recommendation(s):

Part 1-Porch: The application does not contain sufficient information to recommend approval of either scope of work proposed for the side porch: demolition and new stair construction or demolition and reconstruction. It is recommended by HARB that the owner engage a professional to determine the scope of work demolition and construction of new stairs versus demolition and reconstruction to assist the applicant in project planning. It is recommended that the porch portion of the application be tabled for future consideration and to incorporate HARB's opinion. Drawings and detailed description of the proposed scope of work, including materials to be used, should be submitted. It is understood that the applicant has consulted with a mason. A description of current conditions from the mason, or the mason's attendance at a HARB meeting, would be beneficial to better understand the need for demolition.

Part 2: Roof, flashing, soffits, and trim: The proposed use of an EPDM roof on the flat, non-visible portion of the roof is acceptable. The proposed slate, and wood trim work on the turret roof is recommended for approval. True slate materials are recommended in locations of deteriorated slate with Ecostar Empire Slate or Majestic Slate as approved alternatives. Alternate slate should match the original shingles in size, thickness, shape, and color as closely as possible. The new slate should be installed in the same pattern and with the same exposure (the amount of each tile visible) as the existing roof. In this case, the fishscale shape is a key factor. The ridge caps and finial are to be retained and restored if possible or replaced in kind. New material shall match existing in shape, profile dimension and composition. The wood trim and soffit details

should be replicated to match the existing out of wood materials and it is not advisable to add soffit venting.

Part 3: The basement door as proposed with raised rail panels and two glass lites at the top is acceptable and should be painted to match the color of the house and existing door frame which is to remain.

Action

Motion to approve the application as per the above recommendations was made by HARB Chair David Huber, motion was seconded by HARB member Shane Fillman. Motion carried with unanimous support.