

MINUTES

HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING

June 1, 2009

**THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. CITY GOVERNMENT CENTER
PUBLIC SAFETY AUDITORIUM, ROOM 213**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Michael Snyder, Vice Chair
Art Emerick, Asst. Codes Administrator
Bill Fontana
Dudley Smith

STAFF PRESENT: Candace H. Stowell, Deputy Director
Craig D. Peiffer, Urban Planner

OTHERS PRESENT: See attached attendance signature sheet.

CALL TO ORDER: 6:00 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Fontana moved and Mr. Smith seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the May 4, 2009 meeting as presented. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

NEW BUSINESS:

1 1709 North Second Street to remove and replace the front porch

As the applicant was not in attendance, Mr. Fontana suggested the review be tabled until the following month.

Mr. Fontana moved and Mr. Smith seconded the motion to table the review. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

2 409 Herr Street to replace a chain link fence with a six foot cedar privacy fence

Mr. Peiffer gave a synopsis of the case report, recommending approval.

The case was represented by Bryan Moore, 409 Herr Street, Harrisburg, PA

There were no questions from the HARB Members or the public, and Mr. Moore stated that he concurred with the case report.

Mr. Emerick moved and Mr. Fontana seconded the motion to approve the request. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

3 316 North Second Street to install a new sign

Mr. Peiffer gave a synopsis of the case report, recommending approval with conditions.

The case was represented by Mildred Farias, 33 Carousel Circle, Hershey, PA.

Mildred Farias stated that she did not have any objections to the conditions for approval; however, stated that the business was on a limited budget, and therefore, requested additional time to install a permanent sign. Mr. Fontana inquired on the timeframe the applicant was requesting. Ms. Farias replied she had to ascertain costs before she could commit to a deadline. Mr. Snyder presumed the cost of high density foam board would be similar to vinyl. Mr. Fontana asked the board and staff what would be a reasonable timeframe. Mr. Emerick suggested ninety days with the option for an extension. Ms. Farias agreed to the suggested timeframe.

Mr. Fontana moved and Mr. Smith seconded the motion to approve the request with the conditions listed in the staff report, including the ninety day timeframe. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

4 223 Verbeke Street to replace a metal roof with architectural shingles and replace corrugated metal siding on the dormer with cement board siding

Mr. Peiffer gave a synopsis of the case report, recommending denial. He added that he had spoken with Ms. Wohlbach, the property owner, prior to the start to the meeting. Ms. Wohlbach indicated she has had significant roof leaks since installation in 1991. She stated that she was unaware that the contractor had not secured requisite building permits, and added that the contractor had been on-site numerous times to provide repairs, but that the problems continued. She has decided to forego continued repairs and hoped to install asphalt shingles, referencing the adjacent shingle roofs, as a cost effective option with a thirty-year warranty.

The owner was unable to attend the meeting, as such; the case was represented by Timothy Shultz, 4412 Krebs Road, Glenville.

Bill Cooper, 225 Verbeke Street, stated that he was in support of the proposed change. He acknowledged that the existing roof has significant problems and pointed out that there is a hodge podge of roof types within the block. He indicated the asphalt shingles would be more economical and the appearance would blend with adjacent roofs. He also offered that neighboring property owners indicated no opposition to the proposed change.

Dudley Smith inquired if the primary reasoning behind the selection of asphalt shingles was due to cost. Timothy Shultz concurred, stating that he had priced a standing seam metal roof, using Fabral Metal Roof Systems, at a cost of \$6,000 compared to that of the proposed asphalt shingles at \$1,800. He added that the existing metal roof was not made for residential applications, but was found more commonly on sheds, garages and barns.

Bill Fontana inquired if there were other roofing options and Michael Snyder inquired if Staff knew what the original roofing material was. Craig Peiffer first clarified that Staff's recommendation was for the installation of a standing seam metal roof, aluminum or galvanized steel, with a painted finish, which is based upon the 1991 photograph. He added that Staff would consider other options, but would need time to research materials that may have been used in the area during the late nineteenth/early twentieth century. He also indicated that further research would be required to ascertain the original roofing material for the subject property.

Timothy Shultz inquired if Staff and the HARB Board would consider faux slate shingles. Bill Fontana replied he would need to see evidence that substantiated the use of slate before considering the alternative material. Craig Peiffer added that he would consider other materials; however, needed time for due diligence. He added that if slate were supported, there is a product (GAF/ELK TruSlate) that uses a mix of real slate with a faux backer and is competitively priced to that of the all faux product.

Bill Copper asked why the adjacent roofs were acceptable with asphalt shingles. Craig Peiffer stated that only one of those roofs received HARB/Council approval, which entailed an upgrade from rolled roofing to asphalt shingles. He added that unapproved work was subject to after-the-fact reviews and penalties, and that in no case would an in-kind replacement be approved, but would require historic district review. Timothy Shultz asked why the HARB approved asphalt shingles as a replacement for rolled roofing, but not asphalt shingles as a replacement for grandrib metal roofing. Craig Peiffer replied there is a clear distinction between the replacement of one metal roof with another metal roof with differing style to that of a total change in material, style and color.

Timothy Shultz asked if the rear of the roof could be sheathed with asphalt shingles. Art Emerick replied that as it was not visible from the public right-of-way, the applicant may consider any material that meets best practice.

Timothy Shultz asked if the dormer siding could be an alternative material, such as a sheet product. Craig Peiffer stated that would fit within the HARB Guidelines for the use of alternative materials and would be appropriate if a standing seam metal roof were installed; however, he clarified that if the applicant pursues the use of slate shingles, then the dormer siding should then also be sheathed in slate shingles.

Bill Fontana suggested the HARB consider denial of the application; however, with the following options:

A standing seam metal roof is approved by the HARB per the stipulations found within the case report, the metal roof shall be galvanized steel or aluminum standing seam, seam dimensions shall closely match those found on the adjacent roof at 227 Verbeke Street and the selected product shall be pre-finished using either a silver, green or red color.

If there is evidence supporting the use of slate shingles, then the applicant shall submit a specification to HARB for review. The review would be considered a continuation of the current case, and therefore be listed first on the board's agenda.

The HARB Members concurred with Mr. Fontana's suggestion.

Mr. Fontana moved and Mr. Smith seconded the motion to deny the request with the options for approval. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

OTHER BUSINESS:

None.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Fontana moved and Mr. Emerick seconded the motion to adjourn. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote and the meeting adjourned at 6:57 P.M.