

MINUTES

HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING

December 7, 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: 6:04 P.M.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Emerick moved and Mr. Smith seconded the motion to approve the minutes of the November 2, 2009 meeting as presented. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

OLD BUSINESS:

1 220 Peffer Street to review revisions to the approved plan for a new single-family residence

Mr. Peiffer gave a synopsis of the case report. He acknowledged that the applicant had applied for and received a special exception permit for construction in the 100-year flood plain, and therefore the HARB was to strike the second condition for approval. He then stated that staff was recommending approval with the first condition.

The case was represented by Ruggero Scarabello, 301 Chestnut Street, Harrisburg, PA.

Mr. Scarabello stated that it was his intension to install the fiber cement siding with the smooth finish, and therefore he concurred with staff's condition for approval.

Mr. Fontana inquired as to the reason(s) for the proposed changes. Mr. Scarabello stated they were due to economics. Mr. Fontana stated that the HARB was not to consider

economic conditions when determining the appropriateness of changes. Mr. Peiffer stated that it was common to have design revisions with new construction, and cited the case for Campus Square, 1426 North Third Street. He added that Staff was recommending approval based upon the Secretary's Standards, as well as previously approved HARB Cases. Mr. Fontana stated that he was not diametrically opposed to the proposed changes, but felt that the HARB should be consistent with their decision to not consider an owner's economic conditions.

Mr. Smith moved and Mr. Emerick seconded the motion to approve the request with the conditions listed in the staff report. The Board voted three (3) for the motion and one (1) against the motion. As there was no quorum on the vote, City Council must approve or deny the application by resolution within 90 days from the date the application was filed. The application was submitted on October 19, 2009; therefore the resolution deadline will be January 18, 2010. If Council does not reply by the deadline, the revisions reviewed by HARB in December 2009 will be approved by no action.

2 917 Capital Street to review revisions to the approved installation of cementitious siding on the north facade.

Mr. Peiffer gave a synopsis of the October 5, 2009 HARB Resolution. He stated that shortly after the work had begun, he received notice that the siding was being installed with a visible faux grain surface. Upon site inspection, he notified the contractor that they were not in adherence with the HARB Resolution including installation to match the original wood siding in style and profile, as well as the smooth finish to be the visible finish. Both he and the contractor identified options that would achieve compliance with the resolution including flipping the product and sanding the faux grain. Unfortunately, both options would void the manufacturer's warranty, and therefore the owner did not agree to either solution. He clarified that the contractor was trying to find a solution that incorporated the new siding, so as to avoid the cost of restocking and reordering, as well as time delay. He suggested the contractor provide his own warranty for the materials, or his insurance company provide a performance bond. He stated the owner did not accept the contractor's warranty, and the insurance company was not willing to provide the bond. As such, the only course of action was to appeal to the HARB.

The case was represented by Jacqueline Goodwin, 917 Capital Street, Harrisburg, PA; Charles Bitner, contractor, 429 N. East Street, Carlisle, PA; and Peter Dailey, Esq., 242 Wood Street, California, PA.

Mr. Smith inquired if the crux of the issue was to maintain the manufacturer's warranty. Mr. Bitner added it was also to match what was originally there. Mr. Emerick pointed out that the siding was to be smooth finish, and Mr. Bitner explained he thought that meant untextured. Mr. Dailey stated the language was interpretive, and should have said grain side. He added that all existing boards were not smooth. Mr. Emerick stated that in addition to the finish, the siding wasn't installed with the correct reveal.

Mr. Snyder inquired how flipping the board voided the warranty. Ms. Goodwin stated the product must breathe and the new siding was ordered with a factory painted finish. As such, if the product were flipped the opposite side would need to be finished, thus impacting the product's ability to breathe. Mr. Emerick inquired if the warranty would be voided if the product were removed and reinstalled. Mr. Bitner stated that the warranty would be maintained despite reinstallation; he added that it would take six to eight weeks to reorder the siding.

Mr. Emerick referenced the conditions for approval in the resolution and inquired if a product specification was submitted for Staff approval. Mr. Peiffer replied that the specifications were not submitted to the Planning Bureau for approval.

Mr. Smith asked if the area under review was limited to the north, gable end facade. Mr. Bitner confirmed that it was only this area, and added that he had already installed wood siding on the front facade using boards salvaged from the north facade.

Mr. Emerick suggested that the Board consider allowing the contractor to rehang the siding to the correct reveal and permit the faux grain to be the visible surface. He added that for future applications, Staff requires specifications be a part of the Certificate Application. Mr. Smith cautioned that a HARB approval might set a precedent. Mr. Fontana inquired if the contractor and owner were willing to reinstall the siding to match the original reveal, and both Ms. Goodwin and Mr. Bitner agreed.

Mr. Snyder inquired how Staff might tighten conditions for approval, and Mr. Emerick suggested that no building permits be issued until conditions have been satisfied.

Mr. Fontana moved and Mr. Smith seconded the motion to approve the request to reinstall the new siding to match the reveal of the original wood siding. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

NEW BUSINESS:

3 271 Herr Street to replace the third floor slate shingles with GAF Elk Slateline asphalt shingles

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

The case was represented by LeeAnne Clayberger, 271 Herr Street, Harrisburg, PA.

Ms. Clayberger stated she felt the HARB ought to consider the following factors in their deliberations: 1) the replacement cost compared to the value; 2) there are only two homes on the block, and their home is adjacent to a garage and deteriorating building at 1014 North Third Street; 3) the HARB approved the use of non-historic materials for the Harrisburg Midtown Arts Center's Stage on Herr located across the street from their

home; and 4) the value of the home and current residential real estate market. She added that the existing slate has water stains and other signs of deterioration, and her contractor recommended the use of asphalt shingles. Furthermore, the new shingles would mimic the style and configuration of the existing slate tiles, replicating the three bands. She added that the architectural detail at the dormer would also be repaired as part of this project.

Mr. Fontana inquired of the Board's willingness to consider composite slate, excluding asphalt shingles, as this was a third floor location. He then asked of the cost difference between the three products. Mr. Emerick replied asphalt shingles were approximately twenty percent the cost of slate and composite materials were approximately fifty percent the cost of slate. He added that ASTM rates slate lifecycle at 90 years.

Mr. Fontana inquired if the applicant were willing to consider a composite material. Ms. Clayberger, referencing the previous case report for 220 Peffer Street, inquired why the HARB discussed the approval of vinyl materials for windows and siding, but not asphalt shingles for replacement of slate. Mr. Fontana clarified that the discussion was in regards to new construction and this discussion was in regards to historic materials on a circa 1885 home. Ms. Clayberger stated she would consider other materials if someone could provide guidance. Mr. Peiffer stated that he was available to work with Ms. Clayberger to identify various options that could be administratively-approved or recommended for approval to HARB.

Mr. Fontana moved and Mr. Smith seconded the motion to table the request until the applicant had an opportunity to review various replacement options with staff. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

4 1328 Green Street to replace a standing seam metal roof with GAF Elk Timberline asphalt shingles

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

The case was represented by Darlene Wong and Ethan Cancell, both of 1328 Green Street.

Ms. Wong stated she had previously sought approval for roof work and agreed to a repair of the metal roofing using roofing tar. Unfortunately, it turned out to be only a temporary solution, as leaks have resumed resulting in half of the interior ceiling failing and a developing mold problem. She noted that the National Park Service indicates materials selection should consider cost and ease of maintenance. She suggested that the original roof was not metal and the asphalt shingles would mimic the appearance of wood shakes in scale, texture and color. She also felt that a wood shake option would be more susceptible to fire than an asphalt shingle. She inferred that her neighborhood, historically known as Hardscrabble, was known as a poor man's neighborhood, and

therefore differed from Verbeke Street, which was more upscale. As such, she felt the use of asphalt shingles would be in keeping with the evolution of roofing materials.

Mr. Cancell noted that the case report indicated the rear roof had previously been replaced with asphalt shingles, and clarified that the roof remained metal. Mr. Peiffer acknowledged the oversight and stated that the case report would be amended to reflect an all metal gable roof.

Mr. Cancel reiterated that the property at 1319 Green Street, located across the street from the subject property, had been previously approved for the replacement of a metal roof with asphalt shingles.

Mr. Emerick, citing both properties adjacent to the subject property retain their standing seam metals roofs, expressed concern with the prospect of installing non-compatible materials and the greater increase for water leaks. Mr. Fontana added that the applicant may be liable for roof leaks to adjacent properties, if such leaks result from the installation of incompatible materials.

Mr. Fontana inquired if the HARB should consider as part of their deliberations City Council's overturning the HARB decision for 1320 Susquehanna Street. Mr. Emerick stated he felt the HARB should be consistent with their decisions. Ms. Wong stated the HARB would be consistent in approving asphalt shingles, as the HARB previously approved an identical case on an adjacent property. It was noted that the case was from ten years ago.

Mr. Fontana inquired if the applicant would consider a composite wood product. Ms. Wong replied yes, and Mr. Cancell cautioned that if the cost was significantly more expensive than the asphalt shingles, then they could not consider the product as an alternative. Mr. Fontana then asked how much it would cost to replace the roof with asphalt shingles, Ms. Wong replied approximately \$4,000 plus for both sides. Mr. Emerick concurred with the use of composite materials and felt that the HARB should provide Staff with the authority to approve a composite material that replicates cedar shakes.

Mr. Fontana moved and Mr. Emerick seconded the motion to allow staff to identify and approve composite materials, excluding asphalt shingles, which replicate cedar shakes, or otherwise deny the application. The Board approved the motion by a vote of 4-0.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Update on the Academy Manor and North Front Street Proposed Municipal Historic Districts (MHD). Mr. Peiffer stated that City Council had unanimously voted to reject the creation of the Academy Manor MHD. He stated that the Planning Bureau would prepare

a presentation for the proposed North Front Street MHD after the New Year, when a new chair would be appointed to the Building and Housing Committee.

Update on the Certified Local Government Grant and the 2010 HARB Retreat. Mr. Peiffer stated the Planning Bureau would submit a grant application to the Pennsylvania Historical and Museum Commission seeking funds for Planning Staff and board development. He announced the retreat would be held on Saturday, March 27, 2010, from 9:00 AM to 2:00 PM, in the Pennsylvania Room at the Harrisburg Transportation Center.

Mr. Peiffer reviewed the 2010 Land Use Boards Schedule and noted that there would be no HARB meeting in January 2010.

ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Fontana moved and Mr. Emerick seconded the motion to adjourn. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote and the meeting adjourned at 8:25 PM.