

**CITY OF ALLENTOWN
HISTORICAL ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
FINAL REVIEW SHEET
JUNE 5, 2017**

Case #HDC-2017-00009 – Proposal to amend current COA to allow existing fenestration

Property located at: 223 N 11th Street
Old Business Agenda #2
Historic District: Old Allentown
Case #HDC-2017-00009
Meeting date: June 5, 2017

Property Owner: Tim F Driscoll
Owners Address: PO Box 54 Macungie,
PA 18062
Applicant: same
Applicant's Address: same

Building description, period, style, defining features: This structure is a 3 story, 3 bay, painted brick/stone attached end-of-row house that formerly had a storefront. The house has a Mansard roof with small dormer and corner tower, corbelled brick details at cornice and tower, segmentally arched window openings, aluminum siding in the former storefront, and deteriorated front stoop. The house dates from c. 1890 and is Eastlake/ Queen Anne in style.



current

1994

Proposed alterations: It is proposed to amend current COA to allow existing fenestration.

Staff Approvals: n/a

Background:

HARB Case #1994-44 - Heard/approved on November 7, 1994-Approved by Council November 15, 1994.

To improve first floor appearance by:

1. Removing aluminum siding at first floor front façade
2. Replacing brickote to match remainder of building at first floor front façade
3. Replacing existing first floor front façade windows with sash windows
4. Replacing existing front door with a six panel steel door

Applicant Amendments:

First floor windows will be made narrower. An arch will be made in the brickote above the windows. Will consider using a wood door.

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:** 5. Guidelines for Existing Buildings and Structures, 1. Repairs, Replacement and Alternate Materials, 4. Walls, Siding and Trim, 5. Windows, 6. Doors, 7. Porches and Stoops

Evaluation, effect on historic district, recommendations: It is not clear which windows the applicant wants to keep as existing.

From May meeting:

Discussion: The details of the proposed work were discussed with the applicant. He said he would be using Trimline aluminum clad wood windows to replace the existing jalousie windows on the first floor front. He said he planned to match the size, sill height, and would recreate the segmental arches. After some hesitation he agreed to relocate the door to the right of the former storefront and to use new brickote to match the existing to infill the former storefront. Ms. Jackson also expressed some hesitation about using brickote, but the Historic Consultant explained that the State Historic Preservation Office has approved its use in certain circumstances. In this case the brickote on the rest of the building is in good condition and not proposed to be removed. It was concluded that this would be a good instance to use brickote to return the façade to its more original appearance.

The new door specification was reviewed, and it was agreed that a 2/3 or 3/4 light door would be appropriate. The HARB required a transom to be installed above the door and requested that a segmental arch be recreated in the brickote above the door. The material of the door was agreed to be appropriate in wood or smooth fiberglass.

The work on the front porch was discussed and the applicant said he planned to reconstruct the porch in concrete with an appropriate bull nose detail. The basement entry on the side would be removed and new steps constructed in front of the new door in its place. The applicant said he planned to use a railing on the porch to match the one on the attached house. It was agreed that it was appropriate.

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

1. The proposal to façade repairs at 223 N 11th Street was presented by Tim Driscoll.
2. The existing front entry door will be shifted to the right and replaced with a 2/3 or 3/4 light wood or smooth fiberglass door with a transom. (It is recommended to paint the wood or fiberglass door)
3. The existing first floor windows on front façade will be replaced with Trimline aluminum clad wood windows matching the size and sill height of the original

windows. Segmental arches will be recreated above the new windows and door. The windows and door must align with the second floor windows.

- 4. The storefront cornice will remain as a remnant of the former storefront in the building.*
- 5. The front concrete porch and sidewalk will be reconstructed as existing and the porch and steps will have a bullnose detail. The bilco door on the right side will be eliminated and new steps to the porch constructed in line with the new door. The new porch will span the entire width of the façade, have the same depth as existing, and have wrought iron railings to match those next door.*
- 6. The new exterior light will operate dusk to dawn. A cut sheet on the proposed light will be submitted to staff for approval.*
- 7. The existing white aluminum siding will be removed and replaced with brickote. The brickote should match the coursing and texture of the original as closely as possible and be painted to match new paint on the rest of the exterior.*

The proposal to recommend a COA was unanimously approved. (6-0; motion carried; Berner, Huber, Jackson, Olson, Roberts, Sell)

Discussion: There was a lengthy discussion of the request to retain the door to the first floor apartment in the center of the façade. Mr. Schleicher assisted the owner in the presentation of additional information on the storefront. He said there were remnants of the old storefront seen in the building. There was some beaded board ceiling material and evidence of the recessed centered door visible. He said he thought the storefront was in the building originally, and that it was not a renovation of a house into a grocery store. The applicant said he wanted to keep the door in the center and install the residential sized windows and brickote as previously approved. Several HARB members commented keeping the door in the center. Ms Jackson said she needed more information to make a decision to keep the door in the center. Mr. Brobst said he preferred the door moved to the side but was OK permitting the door to stay in the center. Ms. Olson said she was not in favor of the hybrid approach and thought it would be odd to keep the door in the center but installed the residentially scaled windows on either side. Ms. Golden, a knowledgeable preservationist at the meeting for one of the other cases, said that if the storefront concept was being kept by keeping the door at the center then it was not appropriate to install the residential windows; if the residential windows are desired then the façade should be treated as a house (as previously approved). The owner said he didn't like the large windows that would be appropriate for the storefront for residential use.

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

1. The proposal to amend current COA to allow existing fenestration at 223 N 11th Street was presented by Tim Driscoll and Tom Schleicher.
2. Option 1: Residential Option: The door will be moved to the side and windows matching the second floor windows in width and approximate height would be installed directly below the second floor windows. (As approved last month)
3. Option 2: Commercial Storefront Option: Not approved at this time; tabled for further information and drawings. In this option the door will stay at the center and larger storefront-scaled windows installed on either side of the door.

The proposal to recommend a COA was unanimously approved. (7-0; motion carried; Berner, Brobst, Huber, Jackson, Olson, Renaut, Sell)

**CITY OF ALLENTOWN
HISTORICAL ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
FINAL REVIEW SHEET
JUNE 5, 2017**

Case #HDC-2017-00010 - Proposal to demolish the building due to a fire.

Property located at: 963 North Street
Agenda #1
Historic District: Old Allentown
Case #HDC-2017-00010
Meeting date: June 5, 2017

Property Owner: Dream Big Investments LLC
Owners Address: 36 N 10th St Office, Allentown PA 18102
Applicant: City of Allentown
Applicant's Address: 435 Hamilton St, Allentown, PA 18101

Building description, period, style, defining features: This structure is a 2 1/2 story, detached, bricktoted masonry dwelling with a simple gable roof, partially enclosed porch with entrance, and missing windows due to a fire. The house dates from c. 1885 and is an altered Federal Revival style. The house is in very deteriorated condition due to the fire and several years of vacancy.



Proposed alterations: It is proposed to demolish the building due to a fire.

Staff Approvals: n/a

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:** 5. Guidelines for Existing Buildings and Structures, 1. Demolition.

Evaluation, effect on historic district, recommendations: This house is located off major streets approximately 1/3 east of N. 10th Street between Gordon and Liberty Streets. It is constructed tight to the existing streets with no sidewalk on the east side facing N. Hazel St. To the north and south on Hazel Street the context is a mix of garages and empty yards. Directly across the street to the south is a concrete block garage. To the east on North St. is a potentially charming street with attached small row homes. This house is not consistent with the architecture to the east, and its demolition will not have an adverse affect on N. Hazel St. or North St. to the east. The building does not appear to be structurally unsound, but it is clearly in deteriorated condition. The reason the building has not been repaired should be discussed. Is there any potential of a viable buyer who would repair the house?

Discussion: Mr. LoPiccolo explained that the house had been vacant since 1995 and that there had been a fire in 2012. The property has been determined "blighted" by the City. Photographs of the interior were viewed. The HARB agreed that demolition of this structure would not have an adverse affect on the historic district. The discussion focused mostly on what the City should do with the site after the building was demolished so that it doesn't become a dump site or simply a parking lot. The HARB was told that the City was in the process of taking ownership of the property. The size of the lot was determined to be approximately 18' x 43.6', and Mr. Kimmerly said the demolition would have to go through a 106 review since CDBG money would be used. Mr. LoPiccolo said they were planning to fill the foundation hole with compacted stone and fill and install a chain link fence. After many suggestions it was decided that if the property couldn't be sold to a neighbor for a garage or parking that it be made into a recreational area for children in the neighborhood. It was recommended that bollards be installed at the perimeter with the suggestion that the property be paved and made into a half basketball court.

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

1. The proposal to demolish the building due to a fire 963 North Street was presented by Alex LoPiccolo.
2. The HARB determined that the demolition of this property would not be adverse affect on the historic district due to the building's location, condition, and lack of surrounding context.
3. After the building is demolished the property should be sold to the neighboring property owner or nearby property owner.
4. If there is no interest in the property, bollards will be installed around the perimeter of the property so that it will not be used for parking.
5. The HARB recommended that the City create a half basketball court by paving the surface and installing a basketball hoop.

The proposal to recommend a COA was approved with one nay. (6-1; motion carried; Approved-Berner, Brobst, Huber, Jackson, Olson, Renault. Mr. Sell voted against the approval to demolish the building because it might encourage further "demolitions by neglect")

Historic Building Demolition Overlay – Crocodile Rock

Property located at: 520 W Hamilton Street
Agenda #IIB
Meeting date: June 5, 2017

Property Owner: Lehigh Land holdings Inc.
Owners Address: 3140B W Tilghman St, Ste 210, Allentown PA 18104
Applicant: City Center Investment Corp
Applicant's Address: 645 W Hamilton St, Ste 600, Allentown, PA 18101

Building description, period, style, defining features: This structure is composed of two attached structures at the corner of Hamilton St. and S. Law St. The property is approximately 60' wide x 230' long. On Sanborn Maps dating from 1897 and 1911 there were 3 houses on the current site. By 1932 the houses are gone and the buildings seen today indicated. The vaguely Art Moderne facades may date from c. 1932 or slightly later. The left side façade (520) has a recess below the roof with a decorative wall treatment. The right side, on the corner, has a band of windows with horizontal muntins typical of the style. The center entrances are highlighted with a raised tower with curved corner and the doors enhanced with stepped jambs/door surrounds. The two sides are unified with tile banding and small storefront cornice. The wall surfaces are primarily brick covered with stucco on the front and brick on the side and rear.



Proposed alterations: It is proposed to demolish the building.

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: 5.** Guidelines for Existing Buildings and Structures, 1. Demolition.

Evaluation, effect on historic district, recommendations: The current building is composed of a number of sections likely built at different times. The façade may have been an alteration in the mid to late 20th century. Although stylistically attractive, the façade does not appear to be the work of a noted architect nor is it a particularly fine example of Art Moderne. If it is determined that the merits of the new building outweigh the importance of retaining these historic buildings, all architecturally significant details (inside and outside) should be salvaged and donated to the Preservation League for reuse on other buildings in the city or elsewhere in the Lehigh Valley. Although demolition is not something the HARB promotes, the demolition of

these buildings would not have a major negative impact on Hamilton St in this block of larger office buildings. The adjacent building to the east is a blocky 4 story office building with brutalist facades. Further to the east are the County Courthouses; directly across the street is the new six story Three City Center building. Plans for the new building should be made available to the HARB. If construction does not start this year, treatment of the site should be considered.

Discussion: The Historic Consultant circulated the historic photograph of the former 5 story Prince's Furniture building that was on the site. The future owner of the property, City Center Investment Group, represented the case to demolish the buildings and described the new building to be constructed. Mr. DiLorenzo from City Center explained some of the more recent history of the buildings on the site. He said there were records in the building department from 1940, 1961, and 1962 when alterations were done to the buildings. The 1961 and 1962 work was related to Eastern Light who occupied the buildings at that time. Crock Rock was the building's most recent use which closed several years ago. It was concluded that the current façade is not historically significant and dates from sometime after the 1960s.

The HARB asked about the new plans for the site. Mr. DiLorenzo said City Center planned a 6 story mixed use building that would include 60 residential units above a mix of commercial, co-working space, and artist studios (3) at the back of the building. He said the design is in schematic design and he did not have plans to show to the HARB yet. In lieu of actual plans and elevations he showed some inspiration images that were part of the thinking for the new buildings. The images showed more traditionally detailed facades than City Center typically had built.

The HARB thought that the demolition of the existing building would not have an adverse affect on Hamilton St for the reasons stated in the Historic Consultant's review. Comments from several HARB members included the following:

- Mr. Brobst and Mr. Sell expressed consent for demolition since the buildings no longer had historic integrity
 - Mr. Renault said he was against the construction of more rental apartment units and was eager to see more home ownership. He was also concerned about parking for the apartments, however he was not against the demolition.
 - Mr. Berner suggested a movie theater be included in the development. He was in support of the demolition.
 - Ms. Golden suggested a bowling alley be considered here or at some other location.
- The applicant said the demand was for rental housing at this time. From his experience, the young professionals eager to live in downtown often buy homes after renting for a period of time. He saw the apartments as stepping stones to becoming future home owners.

The Historic Consultant suggested keeping the stone foundation walls at the south end of the site if possible. The applicant said he would see if that might be possible. The HARB also recommended salvage of any historic materials that remained in or on the building. The applicant said they were planning to have displays of Crock Rock memorabilia in the co-working space.

Motion: HARB upon motion by Mr. Huber and seconded by Mr. Berner adopted the proposal to recommend to the Zoning Board that the building be demolished as follows:

1. The proposal to demolish 520 Hamilton St and construct multi-story mixed use residential and commercial building was presented by Robert DiLorenzo.

2. Because of the lack of historical and architectural significance of the existing building, the HARB supported the building's demolition.
3. The HARB recommended the following mitigation efforts:
 - a. Salvage of any remaining architectural elements and donate them to the Preservation League or other similar organization
 - b. Retention of the stone foundation walls at the rear of the building if possible and compatible with the new construction.
4. The proposal to support the demolition was approved unanimously. (7-0; motion carried; Berner, Brobst, Huber, Jackson, Olson, Renaut, Sell)