



CITY OF ALLENTOWN

30321

RESOLUTION

R180 – 2021

Introduced by the Administration on October 20, 2021

Certificates of Appropriateness for work in the Historic Districts:

- 229 N 10th St.
- 805 W. Chew
- 342-344 N. 9th St.
- 820 W. Liberty

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 property whose respective owner 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:

- 229 N 10th St.
- 805 W. Chew
- 342-344 N. 9th St.
- 820 W. Liberty


WHEREAS, on October 4, 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		
Ce-Ce Gerlach	X	
Daryl Hendricks	X	
Cynthia Mota	X	
Joshua Siegel	X	
Ed Zucal	X	
Julio A. Guridy, President	X	
TOTAL	6	0

THIS IS TO CERTIFY, That the above copy of Resolution No. 30321 was adopted by the City Council of Allentown on the 20th day of October, 2021, and is on file in the City Clerk's Office.



 City Clerk

**HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA
October 4, 2021
FINAL REVIEW**

Property Location: 229 N. 10th

Agenda Item: 2.f.

Case: HDC-2021-00023

Meeting Date: October 4, 2021

Property Owner/Applicant: Cathy Young (owner)/Jason Hill of Chelsea Capital Group (property manager)

Building description, period, style defining features:

This 3-story brick row house, ca 1890 is Composite in style. The mansard roof has a double dormer covered with aluminum siding with a gable roof, corbelled brick brackets and pommels at the ends of the dentilated cornice, scalloped slate and a single chimney. The windows are 1/1 sash with Eastlake lintels. The main entry is a single door with transom, boarded shut grocer's alley and a visible basement window grille. The stoop has iron pipe railing. A projecting flower design in stone decorates the corner and middle of the front wall. A patch of brickote has been removed to reveal red brick beneath.



Proposed alterations:

1. Removal of existing garage, using the concrete pad as a carport.
2. Installation of a new 3' high and 16' long wood picket fence with gate in the rear yard.

Evaluation of Proposed Project:

The proposed garage and demolition of a new fence will have a minor negative impact to the historic property but will not have a direct impact to the main historic building. The garage is detached from the main building and located along the rear property line. According to historic Sanborn fire insurance maps, the garage was a later addition to the property and was constructed between 1911 and 1932. It does not appear to contribute to the historic character of the main building. The wood and brick masonry structure may be original, but the garage door has been replaced and the rear windows infilled. The garage appears to be in fair to poor condition with evidence of efflorescence and open joints at the brick masonry and water infiltration at the wood roof structure. The proposed new fence is wood picket, 3 feet in height. Wood pickets are appropriate and consistent with the Guidelines. The fence is proposed to be setback from the street and a new concrete pad will be poured for a parking area.

Historic District Impact:

The proposed demolition will have a minor impact to the surrounding historic district, in that it will change the existing rhythm of a rear alley within the district. The change will only be visible from the rear alley, North Hazel Street. A variety of scale, design, and materials is already present across the garages on this alley. The proposed demolition does not appear to rise to the level of a significant negative impact to the historic character of the district.

HARB Discussion

The criterion for demolition presents 5 main points, two of which are not relevant to this application, the other three have been applied with responses provided by the client that meet the criteria for demolition.

JH stated he met with two contractors on site, one would not give an estimate stating it is beyond repair. Cost to repair is twice the cost to remove.

CY echoed this, stated it is beyond repair, the wood structure is rotted, door doesn't open, sagging structure, roof leaks.

DH asked how it got this bad, was it during current or previous ownership.

JH stated the disrepair predates his involvement on the project.

CY repairs happened under her ownership, by previous property managers that performed the work improperly.

AJ suffers the loss of the streetwall on the corner property would feel more comfortable with something being done on the edge of the property versus pulling it back. Does not find the argument of ease of parking to be justification for the loss of original fabric and the streetwall,

DH agrees.

JH referenced compatibility and relevance of the proposed application since there are other carports in the immediate neighborhood and KP accessed Google Streetview to show this condition.

GL suggested maintaining a portion of the existing brick wall to provide the edge or boundary to the property, in addition car ports and pads do exist on the adjacent blocks creating precedent

DH referenced a previous application that approved a similar solution

HARB suggested retaining a portion of the wall, pointing, and capping it with a masonry material.

CY agreed this was a good solution.

Recommendation(s):

Demolition of existing structures for parking is not generally recommended. However, the existing garage does not appear to be a contributing resource to the surrounding historic district nor is it a significant feature of the main historic building. According to the Guidelines demolition criteria, a structure's location on a primary, secondary, or alleyway should be considered, as should the hierarchy of accessory structures to primary structures. The applicant stated that they consulted two licensed professionals on the feasibility of rehabilitation. It is recommended that the applicant clarify the existing conditions and these opinions of feasibility for HARB's consideration.

Action

Motion to approve demolition of garage and partial demolition of the existing brick wall along the property edge down to knee wall height of 3'-0", repoint the wall and add a brick or cast stone coping, ensure the existing concrete pad is in good condition, repair as needed and provide adequate drainage was made by HARB member Patricia Jackson, motion was seconded by HARB member Glenn Lichtenwalner. Motion carried with unanimous support.

**HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA
October 4, 2021
FINAL REVIEW**

Property Location: 342-344 N. 9th St.

Agenda Item: 2.e.

Case: HDC-2021-00022

Meeting Date: October 4, 2021

Property Owner/Applicant: Tim Driscoll

Building description, period, style defining features:

342: This 3-story brick row house, ca 1889, is a porch house with Eastlake influences. The 3rd floor dormer has a finial on its peak, the mansard roof is covered with slate, there are projecting eaves. There is a single chimney on the left side of the roof. The porch has an Eastlake type peak over the steps with a double-glazed door which has decorative moldings and a transom, the 1st floor windows are 1/1 sash. The porch has wooden turned columns, railings, balusters and frieze. There are 2 basement window grilles visible.

344: This 3-story brick end of the row house is a Queen Anne porch house with Eastlake influences. ca 1889, the mansard roof has scalloped slate. It displays a dormer that has a bracketed gable roof, scalloped slate in the peak of the gable and a finial atop the peak. There is also a small window to the left of the dormer. There is a bracketed projecting eave between the 2nd and 3rd floors that has a decoratively stenciled frieze. A dormer on the side of the house is also visible. There also appears to be a side porch with 2 stories above it.

The windows are 1/1 sash set into segmental brick arches. The window openings are topped with segmental brick arch lintels. The main entry is a single modern door with projecting moldings. The porch has been enclosed with brick and glass blocks. The concrete steps have a wrought iron railing with a peak roof over them. There are 2 basement window grilles visible



Proposed alterations: *Violation Correction*

1. Front porch disassembled and removed. To be reassembled using:
 - Original decorative elements
 - Pine 1x6 beadboard porch ceiling
 - Roof material to be determined, proposed as shingles or torch down rubber
 - Southern Yellow Pine 1x4 tongue & groove porch deck
 - New wood railing with details to be determined.
2. Cornice disassembled and removed. To be reassembled using the same decorative elements with select pieces being custom fabricated due to damage including brackets. More details should be provided by applicant.

Evaluation of Proposed Project:

The porch disassembly and partial removal has significantly impacted the historic building and the proposed reconstruction as submitted will negatively impact the building. The proposal to reconstruct the porch roof with wood and install beadboard at the ceiling are appropriate choices of materials. Reuse of original woodwork is encouraged and appropriate. The scope of work at the porch deck, railing, and brick base is insufficiently explained. The submitted elevation drawing of the proposed porch railing differs significantly from the existing design of the porch and is not appropriate. The porch floor level appears to be dropped below either the existing brick base or a new wall. The proposed railing is a capped picket with no columns; the existing railing is a two-level wood railing with molded caps and the porch columns are ornate turned wood over fluted bases that are key elements of the porch's design and match the adjoining building. The treatment of the brick base is unspecified. Tongue-and-groove wood boards are proposed for the porch deck, which is an appropriate material selection. However, the existing condition of the porch deck appears to be in fair condition and may not warrant full replacement; the reason for replacement should be discussed, including any life safety or code requirements. The columns and railing also appear to be suitable for repair and reuse, and a code-compliant design could be achieved.

There is insufficient information to fully evaluate the proposed reassembly and restoration of the cornice. Reuse of the original decorative elements and custom fabrication of replacement elements to match the originals is encouraged and would be appropriate as a general approach.

Historic District Impact:

The proposed porch reconstruction negatively impacts the surrounding historic district by altering one of its dominant character-defining features of the street. The full impact will depend on the final design of the project. Front porches are distinctive features of the individual building and historic district, especially with intact decorative woodwork. Preservation and reuse of existing original materials has the potential to have a possible impact. Significant removal of original materials and replacement with new designs will negatively impact the district.

HARB Discussion

KF noted the incompleteness of the application materials provide, hence the HARB consultant's recommendation below. There was extensive discussion between the owner, contractor and HARB members about the appropriate approach and design intent. HARB requested additional materials be provided including a materials list, drawings and photos illustrating the level of detail to be employed on the project. HARB agreed to allow the proposal to move ahead, providing the detailed information was provided by the owner as put forth in the motion to approve (see below under Action). In an attempt to allow the owner to proceed with certain work, KF suggested the owner create a separate application for the porch decking that can be approved at staff level as they await the COA for the remainder of the project which will be presented to City Council on October 20th.

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the HARB advise the applicant on appropriate materials and design features, particularly for the porch railing, and that additional drawings detailing the proposed scope of work are submitted for review.

Select recommendations include:

- Shingle roof material is recommended over torch-down rubber (both options are currently proposed).
- All original wood components should be retained and reused to the greatest extent possible, including but not limited to the porch columns, the railing, the entrance pediment, and any elements that have already been removed and are planned for reinstallation.
- Provide information on how the new porch roof will be properly flashed into the brick masonry façade and what drainage is proposed.

For the cornice scope of work, documentation of the salvaged cornice pieces and their condition, drawings of the size and profile of the pieces to be replicated, and information about how the cornice will be reinstalled into the brick masonry facade are suggested details to be provided by the applicant.

Action

Motion to accept the application with the stipulation that all original wood components be retained and reused to the greatest extent possible, like for like materials be used for replacement components; the owner and contractor provide photos for reference from the side of the building, showing details to be replicated on the front of the building; provide photos for the cornice and drawings for the rafter tails, provide materials list, remove the porch topper railings, provide 5" ½ round gutters and 3-tab asphalt roof shingles. The owner and contractor to provide a bracket

and cornice panel mockup to KP for review. The motion as stipulated above was made by HARB Chair Dave Huber, motion was seconded by HARB member Patricia Jackson. Motion carried with one vote in opposition from HARB member AJ Jordan on the basis that a more detailed application be presented prior to HARB approval.

**HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA
October 4, 2021
FINAL REVIEW**

Property Location: 805 W. Chew

Agenda Item: 2.d.

Case: HDC-2021-00021

Meeting Date: October 4, 2021

Property Owner/Applicant: Rafael A. Recio & Gesenia Rodriguez

Building description, period, style defining features:

This 3-story brick row house, ca 1865 is Italianate in style and is a combination of commercial and residential usage. The roof is flat and cannot be seen, there may be a shared chimney. The 1st floor is a business with a large window; the main entry is a single glazed door with an Allentown Porch Roof over the door. There are concrete steps and a stoop with wrought iron railings leading up to the door. The 2nd floor has a single 2/2 sash window with an Edwardian three window bay with a cornice. The 3rd floor has three 2/2 sash windows, all the single windows have curved projecting Italianate lintels. The brick has been painted white with gray paint below the 1st floor windows. There are two basement windows that look to be boarded closed. The Allentown Roof that is in place over the doorway is a cyma-curve profile hood with closed ends and decorative wood brackets, the rafters are hidden and roof is asphalt shingles. This hood is one of six Allentown Porch Roofs in the neighborhood.



Proposed alterations:

1. Replacement of existing window sign with new window sign.

Evaluation of Proposed Project:

The proposed sign replacement does not contribute to the historic character of the building; however, the existing window sign also negatively impacts the building. The proposed sign appears to cover approximately the same amount of window area as the existing sign. The proposed lettering colors use darker blue than the existing sign, which appears to help the sign blend better into the background when the window is uncovered. This potential reduced visibility is encouraged; however, the lettering will likely be just as visible when the window is covered from the interior. The proposed design is symmetrical and more evenly divided across the two-light storefront window than the existing sign.

Historic District Impact:

The existing and proposed window signs do not contribute to the character of the surrounding historic district. The proposed sign does not appear to have more of an impact on the district than the existing sign. In the symmetrical design and darker lettering, it may be considered a slight improvement.

HARB Discussion

KP explained the history of the signage approval and the zoning approval process. The previous sign was approved in 2008.

AJ asked about HARBs purview over signage

KP referenced the preliminary review document with the Design Guidelines Section 11 paraphrased

AJ finds it appropriate

GL Noted the guidelines literally read “window lettering” and historically appropriate lettering would be preferred

DH stated the graphics are not in violation of the guidelines

AJ and GL do not feel it is HARBs purview to design the logo and that HARB should approve it as is

Recommendation(s):

To reduce the visual impact of the signage on the historic building and the surrounding district, it is recommended to use smaller, simpler window lettering and designs, and to reduce the overall amount of window area that is covered. The proposed sign is close to a like-for-like replacement of the existing sign in appearance and size, and it is recommended to consider any relative advantages of lettering color and symmetrical design. The proposed sign must comply with City zoning requirements for signage.

Action

Motion to accept the application with the recommendation to change the phone number to white numbers and remove the infill pattern on the graphic representation of scissors was made by HARB member Glenn Lichtenwalner, motion was seconded by HARB Chair Dave Huber. Motion carried with unanimous support.

**HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA
October 4, 2021
FINAL REVIEW**

Property Location: 820 W Liberty St.

Agenda Item: 2.c.

Case: HDC-2021-00020

Meeting Date: October 4, 2021

Property Owner/Applicant: Adriano & Angela Almonte

Building description, period, style defining features:

This 3-story brick row home ca 1887 is a Second Empire house. The mansard roof has asphalt shingles with a double dormer, projecting eaves and Italianate brackets. The windows have 1/1 sashes with Eastlake lintels. The main entry is a single glazed door with a transom. There are 2 basement window grilles visible. There is a grocer's alley leading to the backyard.



Proposed alterations: *Violation Correction*

1. Replace inappropriate replacement front entry door with an appropriate front entry door

Evaluation of Proposed Project:

The proposed door replacement will have a positive impact on the historic building. The new door matches the door that was intact before the violation occurred. This door was wood with two lower panels and a large upper panel of glazing. The proposed new door matches this door in its materials, construction, and appearance. The proposed door is appropriate. No information for proposed hardware was submitted.

Historic District Impact:

The proposed replacement will have a positive impact on the surrounding historic district. The new door matches the previous two-panel and single-light wood door that existed at the building. The new door will replace the inappropriate current door that negatively impacts the appearance of the block, and the new door will contribute to the historic character of the district.

HARB Discussion

HARB Chair DH discussed with the owner AA present for the applicant the condition of the existing door frame and the owner confirmed that the frame will be removed, and the opening restored to its original dimension and appearance and the threshold will also be replaced. AA asked what type of material would be appropriate for the threshold. DH responded the material would have historically been bronze or wood. KP asked for more specifics on the hardware, the HARB consultant to provide suggestions for hardware manufacturers. HARB member PJ asked if the mail slot would be returned, AA responded affirmatively and that it would be made secure.

Recommendation(s):

The door replacement is recommended for approval. It is recommended to clarify if the original wood frame was retained and can be repaired and reused, or if a new wood frame will be installed as well. Period-appropriate hardware is recommended. Paint colors are not regulated by HARB; it is suggested that the door paint color match the existing grocer's alley door and window color.

Action

Motion to accept the application with the recommendation to use historically appropriate hardware and the stipulation that the old door and pre-hung frame be removed entirely, the jambs be restored, and the threshold replaced with an historically appropriate material either wood or bronze was made by HARB Chair Dave Huber, motion was seconded by HARB member Glenn Lichtenwalner. Motion carried with unanimous support.