



CITY OF ALLENTOWN

30347

RESOLUTION

R203 – 2021

Introduced by the Administration on December 1, 2021

Certificates of Appropriateness for work in the Historic Districts:

- 28 N 11th Street
 - 301 N 9th Street.
-

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:

- 28 N 11th Street
- 301 N 9th Street

WHEREAS, on November 1, 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. 30347 was adopted by the City Council of Allentown on the 1st day of December, 2021, and is on file in the City Clerk's Office.



City Clerk

**HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF ALLENTOWN
November 1, 2021
FINAL REVIEW**

Property located at: 28 N 11th Street

Agenda Item: #3.a.

Historic District: Old Allentown

Case: HDC-2021-00013

Meeting date: April 5, 2021/ June 7, 2021/ October 4, 2021/ November 1, 2021

Property Owner/Applicant: Chelsea Capital Group LLC

Building description, period, style defining features:

This 2½-story brick row house, ca 1888, is a Queen Anne Porch house with Eastlake influences. The slate gable roof displays a single dormer, snow catchers, and a bracketed, denticulated cornice with an extensively stenciled frieze board. The dormer has a 1/1 sash replacement window. There is a single shared chimney.

The 1st and 2nd floor windows are 1/1 sash set into openings topped with incised Eastlake lintels. The main entry is a glazed single door with a transom. The porch was previously altered with the replacement of the turned balustrades with a smooth board façade. Turned wood balustrades were reinstalled. There is a grocer's alley door with a transom and an incised Eastlake lintel. There are concrete steps.



Proposed alterations:

Applicant submitted application for review in April 2021 at which time the HARB granted a 60-day extension (see April meeting minutes for full details) An additional 60-day extension was granted in June and a final extension granted in August.

The applicant has decided to pursue only the replacement of the inappropriate support that was installed as a response to a housing violation until a coordinated effort is made to reconstruct the porches on the block.

The October 4th submission also includes replacement of windows that were changed previously without HARB approval. The HARB granted a one-month extension for the applicant to pursue a custom column as well as windows of an appropriate color.

Applicant submitted a custom porch column quote, scope of work and two window options (on aluminum and one aluminum clad)

Staff Approvals:

1. None

Violations:

1. 2004: Replacement of front porch balustrade-reversed

Prior COA(s): None**Secretary of Interior Standards:**

Standard #2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Standard #6: Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary, physical, or pictorial evidence.

Design Guidelines Section 5-Windows:

Replacement: The Replacement of a window refers to the installation of a new custom sized wood window sash into the existing window frame. Window replacement is recommended only for windows with irreparable deterioration. If the repair of a window is not possible and replacement is required, the replacement window unit should match the historic window unit in design, dimension and pane configuration. The replacement of an historic wood window with a new wood, aluminum clad wood, smooth fiberglass, or wood composite window requires staff approval. In all cases, the appearance of true divided lights on an historic window must be retained through the use of simulated divided lights (SDL) on the new window. All other requests for window replacement require HARB approval.

- Replacement of historic wood windows on a primary facade with a new wood, aluminum clad wood, smooth fiberglass, or wood composite windows may be acceptable depending on the condition of the existing historic wood windows.
- Replacement of historic windows on secondary facades with alternate materials requires staff approval. Specifications of new window must be provided to staff for approval.
- Replacement windows must match the size of the existing historic windows. Reducing the size of the window opening is not typically permitted.
- Improvements in thermal performance can be achieved through repairing historic windows and installing interior or exterior storm windows. The replacement of historic window units with new window units to improve thermal performance is not recommended. (See energy efficiency)

Design Guideline Section 7-Porches, Stoops and Steps:

If features of porches and stoops require replacement, the component used for replacement should replicate the historic material, configuration, dimension, detail and design.

- Use of vinyl railing systems and unpainted pressure treated lumber is typically not appropriate.

Evaluation of Proposed Project:

The existing 6x6 post is an inappropriate alteration and requires reversal. The lumber post does not match the existing historic porch features and is not consistent with the Design Guidelines. The replacement of the lumber post with a new custom turned wood post that replicates the historic post is appropriate. The proposed custom post is to be fabricated to match the existing middle porch column in size, profile, dimension, and appearance. The custom in-kind replacement is an appropriate treatment.

The poor condition of the porch roof and base has been noted in past reviews. The replacement of the lumber post with a new wood post will not address all existing structural and appearance issues.

The proposed replacement of the inappropriate replacement windows appears to be appropriate. The window openings are proposed to be returned to their original dimensions and new frames will be installed. The proposed window options are double-hung aluminum or aluminum-clad wood windows. Aluminum-clad wood windows are an acceptable alternate according to the Guidelines. The proposed windows are 1-over-1 and will match the original windows and existing windows at this facade.

Historic District Impact:

The replacement of the lumber post with a new historically appropriate wood post will have a positive impact on the surrounding historic district. The existing lumber post negatively impacts the surrounding district as a highly visible inappropriate repair and replacement. The correction of the inappropriately altered windows will have a positive impact on the historic district by returning the openings to their original dimensions.

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended to replace the existing lumber post with a new wood post. The proposed custom turned wood post that replicates the historic turned wood post in size, dimension, profile, appearance, material, and finish is the preferred treatment. The design of the post should match the existing turned wood post at middle of porch. When replacing the column, retain all existing surrounding historic porch material, including but not limited to wood balustrades, intermediate full-height post, and newel post.

The proposed window replacement appears to be appropriate by correcting the windows altered without HARB approval. The new aluminum-clad wood windows are consistent with the Guidelines and the window openings will be returned to their original dimensions. New wood frames, brick molds, and trim should match the original. Aluminum-clad wood windows are recommended over aluminum windows due to their better performance and appearance.

The repair and restoration of the porch base and steps is still recommended. Previous recommendations and HARB discussion should be considered.

HARB Discussion

- Part 1: Porch Repairs, the applicant proposed a like-for-like replacement which the HARB unanimously approved.
- Part 2: Window Replacement, the applicant proposed aluminum clad windows, custom sized to fit the original masonry openings and provide necessary repairs to surrounding masonry and wood trim. The windows meet the Guidelines and were unanimously approved by HARB.

Action

- Part 1-Porch Repairs: A motion to approve the custom turned yellow pine column fabricated to match the original in profile and dimension.
- Part 2-Window Replacement: A motion to approve aluminum clad Majesty line windows manufactured by Harvey, to replicate the original size and one over one configuration. The color will be almond and the one existing window to remain will be painted to match.

The Motion (Parts 1 & 2) was made by HARB chair David Huber, motion was seconded by HARB member AJ Jordan. Motion carried with unanimous support.

HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF ALLENTOWN
November 1, 2021
FINAL REVIEW

Property located at: 301 N 9th St.
Agenda Item: #2.c
Historic District: Old Allentown
Case: HDC-2021-00025
Meeting date: November 1, 2021

Property Owner: MGR Real Estate LLC
Applicant: Nathaniel Carrasco

Building description, period, style defining features:

This 3-story brick end of row building, ca 1890. It is used for both residential and commercial purposes. There are three floors with a flat roof. There is a single chimney. The windows on the 2nd and 3rd floors are 6/1. The 2nd and 3rd floors are brick; the 1st floor commercial use area has a pent roof running along the front and side facades above the 1st floor. There is a single glazed door with a stoop constructed of concrete with metal tube railings.



Proposed alterations:

1. Installation of three new window signs and review of security camera location.

Staff Approvals: None

Violations:

2013: Sign without COA

2018: Illuminated window sign and satellite dish

Prior COA(s):

1997: Window signs and temporary banner.

2006: Installation of 6/1 off-white vinyl windows on 2^d and 3rd floors, capping of the window trim on the upper windows with aluminum to match the windows; installation of aluminum framed, tinted glass commercial windows on the 1st floor, installation of 4 aluminum framed commercial glass doors on the 1st floor, restoration of the ½ glazed wood residential door on 9th st., installation of 6-panel wood or steel residential door on Chew St.; removal of the wood paneling and restoration of the brick on the 1st floor; installation of black slate line shingles on the pent roof; and reconstruction of the pent roof soffit with new plywood to be painted.

2008: Installation of handicapped ramps for the two commercial units, both ramps on Chew Street side, the ramp to be made of concrete, the pipe railings to have ball joints and be painted to match the design of the existing railing on the 9th Street side.

2009: Installation of 2'x4' sign of vinyl lettering directly to the window glass.

Secretary of Interior Standards:

Rehabilitation Standard 2: The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.

Design Guidelines-Section 11: Signs

Signs located in designated historic districts must be compatible with and appropriate for the style and character of the historic buildings. The material and style used for a sign should be compatible with the building's historic character. When mounting signs on masonry walls, anchors should be placed in mortar joints instead of in brick, stone or other historic masonry.

- ✓ Window lettering, wall signs, hanging or projecting signs, window awnings and portable signs are acceptable options for signage.
- ✓ Commercial storefronts with long horizontally proportioned signs above are appropriate.
- ✓ Residential structures should use smaller signs placed beside entry doors.
- ✓ Lighting for signs should be external white light from projecting lamps at the top of the sign and all wiring should be discrete and concealed. Gooseneck style lights are historically appropriate.
- Internally illuminated LED or neon "OPEN" signs are appropriate if there are no illuminated borders (straight or arched), they do not blink or flash and they have a black or clear background. "OPEN" signs require staff approval.
- Signs should not cover or conceal architectural features or ornament and signs should be mounted in a way that does not damage historic materials.
- All signs must also comply with the City's zoning ordinance, which regulates, among other things, the size of the sign.

Design Guidelines-Section 15: Mechanical, Electrical and Communications

Mechanical, electrical, and communications equipment and devices such as ventilation louvers, fans, alarms, cable boxes, utility meters, intercoms, satellite dishes and security cameras should be mounted on secondary facades. Equipment and devices should be mounted in an unobtrusive location or painted to minimize their visual impact.

- Mounting mechanical, electrical, and communications equipment and devices on a primary façade is not appropriate.
- Equipment such as a satellite dishes should not be mounted on sloped roofs visible from the public Right-of-Way on which the building fronts.

Evaluation of Proposed Project:

The proposed signage consists of two window signs placed on the storefront windows, one at each façade, and one at the door. The proposed location of exterior security camera(s) was not indicated in the application. The storefront materials are not original, and it is not architecturally distinctive, therefore the proposed signage will not negatively impact historic fabric. The proposed window signs are applied lettering and the business' logo with a high amount of transparency, which can reduce the overall impact of the bright color proposed.

Historic District Impact:

The proposed signs will have a minor impact to the surrounding historic district because they are visible changes at a corner building. As applied window signs, the impact of the proposed work can be considered reversible, which is encouraged. The replaced commercial storefront does not contribute to the district's historic architectural character and the proposed signage appears to have only a minor potential impact.

HARB Discussion

HARB suggested painting the security cameras and wiring to blend better with the surrounding architecture.

Applicant requested installing an "open" and "closed" illuminated sign, it was stated that this signage can be approved at staff level.

Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that the applicant indicate the proposed location(s) and number of exterior security cameras that are part of the application. It is generally recommended to reduce the visibility of exterior equipment as much as possible.

Action

A motion to approve the application as proposed with the recommendation that the security camera and wiring be painted to match the soffit was made by HARB member Ellen Roberts, motion was seconded by HARB member Michelle Olson. Motion carried with unanimous support.