MINUTES OF THE
HISTORICAL ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
CITY OF ALLENTOWN, PENNSYLVANIA

Monday, May 6, 2024

---

1. Call to Order

The monthly meeting of the HARB was held on Monday, May 6, 2024, in a hybrid format combining an in-person meeting with a Microsoft Teams virtual meeting. The meeting was called to order at 6:14 p.m. by Mr. David Huber, Vice Chair.

HARB Members present:
Alex Encelewski, Old Fairgrounds Resident
Phillip Hart, West Park Resident
David Huber, Vice Chair, Allentown Resident
Joseph Franzone, Building and Construction Supervisor, City of Allentown

HARB Members absent:
Vacant, Real Estate Broker
Vacant, Architect
AJ Jordan, Chair, Old Allentown Resident

Staff present:
Brandon Jones, Planner, City of Allentown
Jesus Sadiua, Chief Planner, City of Allentown
Jessica Stuck, Landmarks SGA, LLC
Amy Ahn Baade SGA, LLC
Melissa Velez, Senior Planner, City of Allentown

Visitors present:
JB Construction, Contractor, 301 N 10th Street
Estiwar Galva, Resident, 825 W. Gordon Street
Butz Roofing, 245 11th Street
Troy P., Contractor, 1413 Linden Street
Family Restoration LLC, Contractor, 421 N. Church Street
Luis Guaman, Contractor, 421 N. Church Street
Mike Cavanaugh, Owner, 240 N. 11th Street
Nate Cleaver, Contractor, 219 N 9th Street

---

2. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Huber moved to table the minutes of the April 1, 2024, meeting due to insufficient sound. Mr. Hart began to second the motion but began to experience connection issues and was disconnected. Mr. Franzone seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

3. Old Business

HDC-2024-00021
Address: 240 N. 11th Street
District: Old Allentown Historic District
Owner: Michael Cavanaugh
Applicant: Michael Cavanaugh
Proposal: Replace Windows

Building Description:
This 3-story brick row house, ca 1893, is an Eastlake style. The mansard roof has asphalt shingles, a double dormer and shared chimney. All the windows are 1/1 sash with flat lintels in the Eastlake style. There is a basement window grille visible, a single main door with a transom. A concrete stoop leading to the door. The exterior wall has gray brickote on it and some of the details are covered.

Project Description:
This application proposes to replace all of the failing or broken windows with vinyl clad with wood interior, painted to replicate the original.

Applicable Guidelines:

Section 3.5 – Windows

3.5.1 Retain and preserve historic windows and all associated components whenever possible, including window sash, frame, hardware, lintel, sill, trim, hood, shutters, and glazing (glass). Retain original windows in type, shape, size, operation, and material. Preserve existing glazing including stained glass as a distinctive feature of the window.

3.5.2 Keep historic wood windows in good condition by maintaining sound layers of paint at exterior and interior surfaces. Where wood has been exposed by paint failure, clean with the gentle methods possible and using lead-safe practices prior to repainting. Scrape peeling or flaking paint using hand tools down to the next sound layer of paint and ensure that the surface is clear of dirt and debris before priming and repainting.

3.5.3 Maintain operable windows, which have inherent energy-efficient advantages for air circulation. Remove paint that has sealed a window closed from the exterior and/or interior.

3.5.4 Inspect and test hardware. Ensure sash locks bring sashes together tightly to keep windows watertight. 3.5.5 Consider weatherization improvements that have minimal impact to historic fabric including sealing or recaulking around exterior and interior trim, installing weatherstripping, and installing storm windows (either exterior or interior) to improve energy efficiency.

3.5.6 Install storm windows customized to fit each window frame properly. Wood and aluminum materials are appropriate. The horizontal rails should align with window sashes. Window finishes should match the window trim or blend with the color scheme of the building. Interior storm windows may be recommended for windows with distinctive lites, artistic glazing, or irregular shapes to preserve the exterior appearance.

3.5.7 Repair, restore, and reuse original windows prior to replacing them. Where one component of a window is deteriorated or broken, repair or replace the individual piece rather than replace the entire window unit. Repair or selectively replace in-kind existing hardware to ensure window operability, including sash cords, weights, and pulleys. Repaired windows have been shown to achieve energy performance levels comparable to replacement windows.

3.5.8 Replace windows in-kind if original windows are deteriorated beyond feasible repair. Wood is the preferred material for most replacement windows. Replacement windows should match the original as closely as possible in material, size, type, operation, profile, and appearance. Replicate the existing dimensions of glazing, configuration of muntins, or unique decorative lites. Match sash and frame thickness and window depths. For existing nonoriginal windows, it is preferred to replace with wood windows rather than new alternate materials.

3.5.9 Replace windows with alternate materials if in-kind replacement is not feasible. Replacement windows must match the original as closely as possible in type, size, operation, profile, appearance, and configuration of lites and muntins.

Aluminum-clad wood windows are an appropriate alternate because they can replicate the original appearance and material. Composite wood or fiberglass windows with paintable exterior surfaces can be appropriate alternates if they match the original appearance but are not recommended from a sustainability perspective. Vinyl windows are not appropriate due to short lifespan, poor performance, and inability to match historic profiles.

3.5.10 Preserve the ratio of window openings to solid wall surfaces. Increasing or reducing openings can impact the proportions of a facade and can look out of place within the larger streetscape. Changing the size of openings will also require a Building Permit because it changes the amount of enclosed space on a facade.

3.5.11 Retain the historic pattern of window openings (fenestration pattern), especially on primary facades. Avoid inserting new windows into a facade or infilling existing windows. The position, number, and arrangement of windows defines the rhythm of a facade and can be a character-defining feature of an architectural style or a type of building use. If creating new openings or infilling existing ones is necessary for a project such as an adaptive reuse, locate openings on side or rear facades.

3.5.12 If replacing a single window on a facade, replicate the existing windows of that facade.

3.5.13 Replace single-pane glazing in-kind whenever possible. Install double-glazed windows with simulated divided lights only upon consultation with Staff/HARB. Replicate the dimensions, details, and appearance of the original window. Simulated divided light muntins should be attached to the window exterior, not sandwiched between the panes of glass.

3.5.14 Avoid reflective glazing in restored or new windows. Reflective glazing makes a window's lites and muntins difficult to see and alters the visual impact from the street. This change makes alterations in the historic district more conspicuous. Clear (non-tinted) and non-reflective glazing and low-e coatings are appropriate.

3.5.15 Replace deteriorated window trim or decorative elements only as necessary to match the size, profile, and material of the original elements. For window lintels or hoods that project from the facade plane and are vulnerable to water collection, consider installing of metal drip edges to shed water away from windows. Copper is recommended and should be left to weather naturally; aluminum is acceptable and should be painted to match surrounding materials. Avoid encasing wood sills with metal or vinyl, as this will trap moisture and may cause more damage.

Observations & Comments:
It is unclear the extent of number of windows and which windows are being replaced.
Replacement with the proposed vinyl clad product is not appropriate. A more appropriate replacement window would be aluminum clad, composite wood, or fiberglass 1 over 1 double hung windows to match the existing. Further information is required to determine if repair is feasible; because if so, retaining and repairing the windows is recommended before replacement.

Staff Recommendation:
It is recommended to retain the windows if at all possible. If replacement is necessary, it is recommended to approve, with conditions, suggesting a more historically appropriate replacement window product.

Presenter:
- Jessica Stuck presented the application.
- Mike Cavanaugh represented the application.

Discussion: It was discussed that the applicant has not provided evidence that the current condition of the windows makes them beyond repair, which would be required in the case of replacement. The applicant noted there are 13 windows that are either cracked, failed, or missing weights and components. The applicant also noted that the repairs

would be more than 10% of the projected sale value of the house. The applicant asked if he were to get a price on repair that was reasonable, if he would have to come back for review. It was noted that if the repairs are like for like, the applicant should let staff know the intention to repair and the application will not have to come before the HARB again.

Action: Mr. Hart made a motion to table the application to the June meeting so the applicant can provide additional evidence to show the windows are not repairable.

Mr. Huber seconded the motion, which carried with unanimous support.

HDC-2024-00025
Address: 222 N. West Street
District: West Park Historic District
Owner: Jose Alfonso Capellan Vicente
Applicant: Jose Alfonso Capellan Vicente
Proposal: Replace front door

Building Description:
This 3-story brick house, ca 1905 is a porch house. The roof has a projecting cornice with brackets, a brick dentilated cornice, 1/1 sash windows and brick lintels. The 2nd floor has pilasters from the mid wall to the roof and the windows are 1/1 sash with brick lintels (arch top on the 3rd floor). The front door contains decorative moldings, including the address in the bottom panel, as well as a transom. The steps are concrete and the cornice has aluminum covering. There is a 2-story ell with 1/1 sash windows with brick lintels.

Project Description:
This application proposes to replace the front door of the residence, which is damaged and does not closed properly, with a smooth fiberglass surface door that is 36" x 80".

Applicable Guidelines:

Section 3.6 – Doors
3.6.5 Repair and restore historic doors whenever possible rather than replace them. Historic doors include front doors, rear doors, and grocer's alley doors. Original materials should not be discarded. If repair and reuse is not possible, salvage may be an option and the existing feature used as a template for replication.

3.6.6 Repair, restore, and reuse existing door frames, jambs, threshold, fixed transoms, and similar components. Existing components are usually historic wood. Replace in-kind if existing materials are severely deteriorated. Replicate the profile and width of door frames, jambs, and transoms in order to preserve the solid-to-void ratio of the entrance.

3.6.7 Repair, restore, and reuse hardware whenever possible. Replace hardware in-kind if necessary. New hardware should match the original hardware as closely as possible if the original hardware remains. If not, hardware that is compatible with the era of construction and style of the building is recommended. Avoid replacing historic hardware with digital locks, combination locks, keypads, or similar technology.

3.6.8 Replace doors in-kind if repair is not feasible. Replacement doors should duplicate the original in material, design, size, profile, and operation. Original doors may be used as a template for replication. Wood is the most appropriate material for residential doors. Paneled wood doors should have the same number, size, and profile of panels as the historic door. If the original design is unknown, the building's style and date of construction should inform the appropriate replacement.

3.6.9 Replace with durable alternate materials if in-kind replacement is not feasible. Composite wood doors and fiberglass doors are acceptable replacements if new doors match the original in size, style, configuration, detail, and appearance. However, these products are not recommended from a sustainability perspective. They have shorter lifespan and deteriorate when exposed to moisture, weathering, and temperature variation. For replacement doors, avoid metal doors (including metal doors that imitate paneled wood), as they do not have the same appearance and texture of historic wood. Avoid pre-hung doors (doors that are purchased already installed in a frame) when replacing a door, because these require the removal of historic fabric and can change the size of the opening.

3.6.10 Preserve the size of the existing door opening. New doors should be custom sized if necessary. Avoid enlarging or filling in original door openings to fit new stock sizes. This alteration will impact the historic character of the building. This action will also require a Building Permit because it changes the amount of enclosed space on a façade.

3.6.11 Consider replacement of a previously altered door with a historically appropriate wood door.

3.6.12 Avoid replacing of a historic door solely for the purpose of improving thermal performance. This intervention is not appropriate for historic material. Install weatherproofing or a storm door prior to replacement.

3.6.13 Avoid creating new door openings on the primary façade. New side or rear doors should be minimally visible from the street. The size and location of new openings should be compatible with the rest of the façade. This type of work will also require a Building Permit.

Observations & Comments:
If the door is beyond feasible repair, replacement with the proposed fiberglass door is not historically appropriate. Ideally, the wood door with original, character defining detailing would be retained and repaired. This door contains an immense amount of character defining features, including the house number detailing. From the photographs, it does not appear that the door material is in poor condition, so perhaps upgrades to the hardware and/or weatherization is more appropriate, instead of replacement. There also appears to be a transom above the door. Given the proposed replacement door dimensions are 36” x 80”, one would assume they plan on either removing the transom or framing down to accommodate the size differential, which is also not historically appropriate.

Staff Recommendation:
It is recommended to retain the door if at all possible.

Presenter:
- Jessica Stuck presented the application.
- Applicant not present to represent the application.

Discussion: It was noted that this is the second month the application has been on the agenda and the applicant was not present, although they mentioned to staff that they would be present at this meeting. Given the 45 day decision timeline, action is required to be taken on the application by the HARB. This application is not related to a violation. It was noted that no evidence was presented that indicated the door could not be repaired.

Action: Mr. Franzone made a motion to deny the application presented on May 6, 2024 for the replacement of doors at 222 N West Street because it did not comply with the Guidelines for Historic Districts: Chapter 3, Section 3.6 – Doors and there were no known unique circumstances that would apply.

Mr. Hart seconded the motion, which carried with unanimous support.

4. NEW BUSINESS

HDC-2024-00028
Address: 825 W. Gordon Street
District: Old Allentown Historic District
Owner: Galva Jimenez
Applicant: Galva Jimenez
Proposal: Replace front door

Building Description:
This 2½-story stonecote row house, ca 1875 is a Federal/Victorian style. The gable roof has slate shingles, snow catchers, a single dormer with a 2/2 sash window and a single chimney with drip ledges. The windows are 1/1 sash with shutters on the 2nd floor. The 1st floor has a picture window with a transom. There is one basement window grille visible.

The grocer's alley door is a solid panel door with transom and a half circle above the transom. There is a concrete porch with pipe railing, a visible basement window grille and an Allentown Porch Roof. The roof profile is a cyma-curve, with simple wood brackets, asphalt shingles and squared ended rafters. The main entry is a single ¾-glazed period door with a transom. There is a 1-story garage at the rear of the property and an iron fence.

Project Description:
This application proposes to replace the front door of the residence, which is broken, not working, and had rotting wood, with a new metal door. Rotted wood trim will be replaced with new wood.

Applicable Guidelines:

Section 3.6 – Doors

3.6.5 Repair and restore historic doors whenever possible rather than replace them. Historic doors include front doors, rear doors, and grocer's alley doors. Original materials should not be discarded. If repair and reuse is not possible, salvage may be an option and the existing feature used as a template for replication.

3.6.6 Repair, restore, and reuse existing door frames, jambs, threshold, fixed transoms, and similar components. Existing components are usually historic wood. Replace in-kind if existing materials are severely deteriorated. Replicate the profile and width of door frames, jambs, and transoms in order to preserve the solid-to-void ratio of the entrance.

3.6.7 Repair, restore, and reuse hardware whenever possible. Replace hardware in-kind if necessary. New hardware should match the original hardware as closely as possible if the original hardware remains. If not, hardware that is compatible with the era of construction and style of the building is recommended. Avoid replacing historic hardware with digital locks, combination locks, keypads, or similar technology.

3.6.8 Replace doors in-kind if repair is not feasible. Replacement doors should duplicate the original in material, design, size, profile, and operation. Original doors may be used as a template for replication. Wood is the most appropriate material for residential doors. Paneled wood doors should have the same number, size, and profile of panels as the historic door. If the original design is unknown, the building's style and date of construction should inform the appropriate replacement.

3.6.9 Replace with durable alternate materials if in-kind replacement is not feasible. Composite wood doors and fiberglass doors are acceptable replacements if new doors match the original in size, style, configuration, detail, and appearance. However, these products are not recommended from a sustainability perspective. They have shorter lifespan and deteriorate when exposed to moisture, weathering, and temperature variation. For replacement doors, avoid metal doors (including metal doors that imitate paneled wood), as they do not have the same appearance and texture of historic wood. Avoid pre-hung doors (doors that are purchased already installed in a frame) when replacing a door, because these require the removal of historic fabric and can change the size of the opening.

3.6.10 Preserve the size of the existing door opening. New doors should be custom sized if necessary. Avoid enlarging or filling in original door openings to fit new stock sizes. This alteration will impact the historic character of the building. This action will also require a Building Permit because it changes the amount of enclosed space on a façade.

3.6.11 Consider replacement of a previously altered door with a historically appropriate wood door.

3.6.12 Avoid replacing of a historic door solely for the purpose of improving thermal performance. This intervention is not appropriate for historic material. Install weatherproofing or a storm door prior to replacement.

3.6.13 Avoid creating new door openings on the primary façade. New side or rear doors should be minimally visible from the street. The size and location of new openings should be compatible with the rest of the façade. This type of work will also require a Building Permit.

Observations & Comments:
If the door is beyond feasible repair, replacement with the proposed metal door is not historically appropriate. Ideally, the wood door with original, character defining detailing would be retained and repaired. This door contains an immense amount of character defining features, including the bottom panel detailing. From the photographs, it does not appear that the door material is in poor condition, so perhaps upgrades to the hardware and/or weatherization is more appropriate, instead of replacement.

Staff Recommendation:
It is recommended to deny the application. The original door should be retained if at all possible.

Presenters:
- Jessica Stuck presented the application.
- Galva Jimenez represented the application

Discussion: It was noted that this application is related to a violation correction. The applicant noted he was knew to Allentown and was not aware of the rules and regulations. He noted the door was in bad condition and when he tried to change the lock, the wood was bad and he was not able to change the lock. The applicant clarified that the masonry opening was not altered, the wood trim was just removed around the opening. Generally, it was noted that the door appears to be in repairable condition and the applicant agreed to rebuild the jamb and repair the existing door, which he still has in his possession. Dave noted the existing wood could be reused and replaced as necessary and a storm door could be installed on the exterior, if desired by the applicant. It was also noted that there are salvage places and locksmiths around the city that could provide replacement hardware or repair the current hardware.

Action: Mr. Huber made a motion to deny the application presented on May 6, 2024 for the door replacement at 825 W Gordon Street because it did not comply with the Guidelines for Historic Districts: Chapter 3, Section 3.6 – Doors and there were no known unique circumstances that would apply. It was recommended that the original door and jamb be replaced to their original condition and that a full view storm door would be acceptable if the applicant chooses.

Mr. Encelewski seconded the motion, which carried with unanimous support.

HDC-2024-00029
Address: 519 Liberty Street
District: Old Allentown Historic District
Owner: Rudy R. Jiminian
Applicant: Rudy R. Jiminian
Proposal: Chimney repair

Building Description:
This 3-story brick row house, ca 1892 is a porch house. The gable roof has asphalt shingles, a shared chimney, projecting eaves and a single dormer. The windows are 1/1 double hung sash with brick lintels and the dormer window has 10/2 with a Queen Anne-stained glass upper sash with stained glass inlays. The windows have ornamental frames and the basement windows have grilles. The main entry is a single door with a closed transom and a grocer's alley door. The front porch is wood with a wooden balustrade railing.

Project Description:
This application proposes to repoint and replace missing bricks at the chimney.

Applicable Guidelines:
Section 3.1 – Roof Features: Chimneys

3.1.22 Repair and restore historic chimneys. Repoint mortar joints with a compatible and historically appropriate mortar that matches the original in composition, strength, hardness, and color.

3.1.23 Rebuild chimneys if necessary to address structural concerns. Dissemble the masonry, carefully salvage and store the masonry units and rebuild to the original profile and dimensions.

3.1.24 Repair and restore existing stucco or cementitious coatings to protect the masonry underneath. Although removal of coatings may be desirable to restore the appearance of the chimney, removal is likely to be costly and potentially harmful to the brick because the coating has adhered to the surface. The brick may be in such a deteriorated state that it cannot be repaired which will require face brick replacement or reconstruction of the chimney.

3.1.25 Retain and repair historic masonry chimney caps and terra cotta chimney pots. Replace in-kind if repair is infeasible. Replacement with a low profile copper chimney cap may also be appropriate.

3.1.26 Avoid shortening or removing chimneys. Altering a chimney can detract from the roof appearance and the overall architectural style. Chimneys that are no longer operable should be capped and retained in place, regardless of any interior alterations.

3.1.27 Avoid adding new stucco or cementitious coatings to historically exposed brick masonry.

Section 3.3 – Masonry

3.3.2 Repair and restore brick masonry whenever possible. Attempt to repair deteriorated or damaged areas prior to replacement. Appropriate repairs include repointing (repairing mortar joints), crack repair, brick stitching, and select area replacement. Avoid removing excess material or a larger area than is required to complete the repair. New bricks should match the existing in color, profile, dimension, surface texture, and composition and physical properties.

3.3.3 Repair and restore existing stone masonry. Attempt to repair deteriorated or damaged areas prior to replacement. Appropriate repairs include repointing, crack repair, Dutchman repairs (in-kind localized patching) , and patching with compatible compounds. New masonry unit should match the existing in type of stone, color, profile, dimensions, and surface texture.

3.3.4 Repoint brick and stone masonry with a compatible and historically appropriate mortar that matches the original in composition, strength, hardness, and texture. Match new mortar joints to surrounding areas in in width, tooling profile, and color. Cut back and repoint mortar joints using hand tools only; mechanical grinders and similar power tools are not recommended as they can lead to excessive damage.

3.3.5 Replace or rebuild exterior masonry walls or features with in-kind materials if repair is not feasible. Replacement masonry units should match the existing in color, profile, dimension, surface texture, and composition and physical properties. Replicate the existing brick bond (how the bricks are laid).

3.3.6 Preserve and restore decorative masonry elements that are important character-defining features, such as brick corbels and patterned brick courses. Avoid altering, concealing or covering, or removing decorative masonry.

3.3.7 Avoid painting, sealing, or coating historically unpainted brick masonry. Adding exterior coatings can trap moisture and cause deterioration of masonry walls. It also detracts from a building's architectural character.

3.3.8 For existing painted or coated exterior walls, maintain and repair the painted surface rather than attempt removal. Removal is not recommended due to the likelihood of damaging the masonry substrate. Avoid removing paint or coatings that are firmly adhered to the masonry. Consider removal of non-historic coatings only if they are demonstrated to be causing or exacerbating other types of deterioration.

Observations & Comments:

Repairing the chimney is appropriate per the design guidelines. Areas where the chimney requires rebuilding should match the existing bonding pattern of the chimney and the replacement units should match the color, profile, dimension, surface texture, and composition of the existing bricks. The mortar used should be compatible with the brick units and match the original in composition, strength, hardness, color, and texture, and should be tooled with the same profile as the original.

Staff Recommendation:

It is recommended to approve this application with following conditions:

- The chimney is rebuilt to the original profile and dimensions, utilizing the existing bonding patterns.
- The replacement brick masonry units match the existing in color, profile, dimension, surface texture, and composition and physical properties.
- Mortar used for repointing matches the original in composition, strength, hardness, and color. It should be tooled with the same profile as the original.

Presenters:

- Jessica Stuck presented the application.
- Rudy R. Jiminian represented the application.

Discussion: It was questioned why this was not a staff approval; but staff noted there are still questions about the staff approval process. HARB members were in agreement with the staff recommendation. The applicant noted that this is a safety issue and the chimney is missing the hood, but the chimney does have a flue. Mr. Huber recommended to have the repair done as soon as possible. Ms. Stuck noted the guidelines have guidance on chimney caps that are appropriate.

Action: Mr. Huber made a motion to approve, with conditions, the application presented on May 6, 2024, for the chimney repair at 519 Liberty Street with the following conditions agreed to by the applicant following sections of the Guidelines for Historic Districts: Chapter 3, Section 3.1 – Roof Features: Chimneys and Section 3.3 – Masonry and find that there are no circumstances unique to the property:

- The chimney is rebuilt to the original profile and dimensions, utilizing the existing bonding patterns.
- The replacement brick masonry units match the existing in color, profile, dimension, surface texture, and composition and physical properties.
- Mortar used for repointing matches the original in composition, strength, hardness, and color. It should be tooled with the same profile as the original.

Mr. Hart seconded the motion, which carried with unanimous support.

HDC-2024-00031
Address: 301 N. 10th Street
District: Old Allentown Historic District
Owner: Julio Blanco
Applicant: Julio Blanco
Proposal: Replace siding

Building Description:
This 2½-story brick end of row house, ca 1885 is Federal/Victorian with Italianate influences. The gable roof has a single dormer, projecting eaves, bracketed cornice, a scrollwork on the frieze, a single chimney with drip ledges and slate shingles. The dormer window has an aluminum awning. There are 1/1 sash windows, the lintels have been removed but it is possible to see the marks where the eyebrow lintels had been.

The main entry is a single modern door, has 3 small windows, with a transom and projecting moldings as well as an aluminum awning. Here also the mark from the lintel that was removed is visible. There is a concrete stoop and steps with wrought iron railing. The foundation is marble and displays 2 basement window grilles. There is a wood fence in the back/side yard.

Project Description:
This application proposes to replace the siding on the rear side of the property.

Applicable Guidelines:
Section 3.2 – Wood Siding & Trim

3.2.4 Repair and restore wood siding, cladding, and trim whenever possible. Preserve wood features such as cornices, brackets, window and door moldings, and bay windows. Trim work is an essential part of a building's architectural character. Unique features of a building should be preserved. Repair historic wood features by patching, piecing-in or Dutchman repairs, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing the wood using recognized preservation methods. Repair may also include limited replacement in-kind of extensively deteriorated or missing parts of wood features.

3.2.5 Replace deteriorated materials in-kind if repair is infeasible. New materials should replicate the original as closely as possible in material composition, size, profile, shape, pattern, and appearance. If historic wood siding or trim was an identifiable or visually distinctive species, it is recommended that the same species be used for the replacement.

3.2.6 Avoid installation of aluminum, vinyl, or synthetic materials that were unavailable when a building was constructed. Aluminum, vinyl, fiber-cement, or other synthetic cladding are not appropriate for historic properties because of their visual impact and because their installation can cause other deterioration problems. It is not

appropriate to cap or cover existing wood with these types of materials. It is not appropriate to remove original wood cladding or trim features and replace them with aluminum, vinyl, fiber-cement, or synthetic materials.
3.2.7 Consider removal of existing aluminum, vinyl, or synthetic cladding over building features. Historic materials sometimes remain intact below this type of cladding and can be restored. In-kind replacement of existing non-historic siding that was in place before the historic district was designated may be allowed in some cases. Consult with Staff and HARB during early project planning stages. Provide photographs or documentation of existing conditions and wall materials below non-historic siding to help determine the appropriate treatment.

3.2.8 Inspect painted wood thoroughly to determine whether repainting is necessary or if cleaning is all that is required.

3.2.9 Remove peeling, flaking, or failing paint to the next sound layer of paint using the gentlest methods possible to protect the integrity of the historic wood surface. Acceptable methods for paint removal include hand-scraping and hand sanding, and when necessary, mild chemical strippers or gentle micro-abrasion methods. Sand blasting, high pressure power washing, and mechanical grinders should not be used to remove paint from any surface. Evaluate the condition of the wood surface (also referred to as the substrate) and address any moisture infiltration and deterioration issues before priming and repainting.

3.2.10 Paint once the surface is clean and dry. Use a paint type that will adhere properly to the wood surface, such as oil based paint. Marine grade paints are also recommended because they perform well over longer periods of time in wet climates.

3.2.11 Recommendation Only: Repaint with the existing colors, appropriate to the building's period of significance, and compatible with the historic character of the district. Paint color is not reviewed by HARB but it is recommended to select colors sensitive to the historic surroundings.

Observations & Comments:
It is not clear based on the application the extent of the siding replacement; whether it is the entire rear portions with siding or just areas of damage. It appears there has been fire damage in the rearmost addition and the existing metal siding, which was previously installed to cover existing wood siding has been pulled away. Based on the photographs, it does appear that the existing wood siding remains beneath the metal siding and is largely intact.
Replacing siding with a vinyl siding is not historically appropriate per the guidelines. It may be acceptable to replace the metal siding with an in-kind replacement, but per Section 3.2.7, the recommended approach would be removing the existing metal siding that is covering the original wood siding and repairing and repainting the extant wood siding.

Staff Recommendation:
It is recommended to deny the application.

Presenters:
- Jessica Stuck presented the application.
- Julio Blanco represented the application

Discussion: The applicant noted that he did not know about the requirement to use the existing material. It was noted that the fire damaged the existing aluminum siding. Discussion was had as to if aluminum siding to match the existing was available to purchase. Two options were discussed: replace the damaged/missing siding with metal siding or remove the metal siding and repair/paint the wood siding beneath. It was noted that the window glazing was also damaged during the fire damage and the frames still remain. The applicant also asked what should be done with the roof, which is currently covered with blue plastic. The roof was not included in this application, but the work can be a staff approval at a later date since it is a flat roof and will be replaced like for like.

Action: Mr. Huber made a motion to approve, with conditions, the application presented on May 6, 2024, for the replacement of siding at 301 N 10th Street with the following conditions agreed to by the application following sections of the Guidelines for Historic Districts: Chapter 3, Section 3.2 – Wood Siding & Trim and find that there are no circumstances unique to the property:

- Repair wood siding and paint.
- Repair broken windows (replace glass) and paint.

Mr. Hart seconded the motion, which carried with unanimous support.

HDC-2024-00033
Address: 917 W. Chew Street
District: Old Allentown Historic District
Owner: Frank Ingrassia
Applicant: Michael Wiener, Symmetry Construction Enterprises
Proposal: Roof replacement

Building Description:
This 2½-story painted brick house, ca 1871 is a composite of Federal/Victorian with Italianate influences. The gable roof has asphalt shingles, one dormer with a 2/2 sash window and a dentilated cornice. There is a single chimney with drip ledges.

The windows on the 1st and 2nd floor are 1/1 sash with aluminum storm windows. On the 2nd floor the window openings are topped by Italianate style lintels. There are two basement window grilles visible.

The house has a single glazed door with a concrete porch. There is a wooden yoked Allentown porch roof covering the width of the porch. There is a rear entry to the house and a shared grocer's alley without a door.

The Allentown Porch roof profile is concave, with decorative wood brackets, scroll-sawn ends and asphalt shingles. This roof is one of five in the row.

Project Description:
This application proposes to remove the old shingles from the roof and replace with new architectural shingles.

Applicable Guidelines:

Section 3.1 – Roofs

3.1.3 Repair and restore original and historic roofing materials whenever possible. Evaluate the condition and cost of repair of original materials before removing and replacing them. Targeted areas of repair or localized in-kind replacement may be the most effective and low-cost solution.

3.1.4 Repair and replace deteriorated flashing or fasteners with materials that are compatible with the roofing material. Roof problems are often caused by failure of these components rather than the historic roofing material.

3.1.5 Preserve architectural features that give the roof its unique and building-specific character—such as dormers, turrets, chimneys, cornices, rolled ridge flashing, cresting, and finials. Repair and restore features; replace in-kind only when necessary.

3.1.6 Replace historic roofing materials in-kind whenever possible if severe deterioration makes a full replacement necessary. Replacement material should match the original in material, dimension, shape, profile, color, pattern, exposure, and overall appearance.
3.1.7 If in-kind replacement is not feasible, replace historic roofing materials with alternate materials that resemble the original as closely as possible. Roof replacement should be sensitive to the original appearance. Replacement materials should match roof slopes or shape.

3.1.8 Replace non-historic roofing materials in-kind or with recommended alternates. If the original material is documented, restoration of the original material is also an appropriate option but is not required. Original roofs may have been replaced long ago, yet asphalt shingles and similar alterations are still considered impacts to the overall appearance. Replacement materials should match the existing in color, pattern, shape, and profile. Greater flexibility is possible with non-historic roofing and using durable high-quality replacements is recommended.

3.1.9 Consider roof ventilation alternatives carefully. Ventilation options are approved on a case-by-case basis and can include ridge vents, louvered vents, or soffit vents. Proper ventilation may extend the life of a roofing system, but in some cases it can lead to condensation problems with long-term effects on the roofing materials and structural components. Refer to Chapter 3.8 Mechanical and Utility Equipment for related guidelines about roof vents.

3.1.36 Repair and restore gutters whenever possible. Types of repairs include repainting wood or metal surface, installing new fasteners, sealing or soldering cracks and open seams, and relining built-in box gutters with new copper sheet metal.

3.1.37 Replace existing gutters in-kind when replacement is necessary due to severe deterioration. Replicate the original construction method of a historic gutter if feasible.

3.1.38 Replace existing downspouts, scuppers, collection boxes, and other drainage elements in-kind. Appropriate alternates to in-kind replacement are round or rectangular downspouts. Smooth surfaces are encouraged over corrugated metal. In the case of decorative scuppers, replicate the profile and details as closely as possible.

3.1.39 Consider alternate materials for gutters in locations that are difficult to access for maintenance or where original materials have demonstrated a pattern of deterioration over time. A fiberglass gutter is an acceptable replacement material for a wood built-in box gutter if it matches the original in profile, size, appearance, and finish.

3.1.40 Avoid vinyl gutters due to poor durability and non-historic appearance.

3.1.41 Install new downspouts in locations that are sensitive to the architecture and will be minimally visible. Run downspouts at secondary facades and along building or porch corners when possible.

3.1.42 Paint gutters and downspouts to blend in with the building exterior. Matching the existing building trim is usually the most appropriate color selection. Copper and terne-coated stainless steel systems should be left unpainted because they weather naturally and develop a protective patina.

Observations & Comments:
The current roofing materials appears to be original slate. The adjacent property to the left has replaced their slate with a 3-tab shingle and the property to the right still retains the original slate. The proposed replacement materials is an architectural shingle that has an exaggerated taper and overlap, which is not historically appropriate. A more appropriate replacement, if not replacing in-kind, would be a replacement material to resemble the original slate as closely as possible. An example of this is the GAF Slateline Shingle or similar.

Staff Recommendation:

It is recommended to approve this application with conditions:

- Replacement material to resemble the original as closely as possible (GAF Slateline Shingle or similar would be historically appropriate.)

Presenters:

- Jessica Stuck presented the application.
- Michael Wiener represented the application.

Discussion: A question was posed to ask if the application includes the dormer. The applicant noted that they would be amenable to using a 3-Tab estate grey shingle instead of an architectural shingle and provided a photograph of the proposed product. It was noted that the 3-Tab shingle does not replicate the slate roofing as appropriately as a product similar to the GAF Slateline. Since the upper roof is a slate material, the 3-Tab is not appropriate and would need to be replaced with slate or a replacement that resembles slate. The color should also match the existing.

Action: Mr. Encelewski made a motion to approve, with conditions, the application presented on May 6, 2024, for the replacement of roofing at 917 W Chew Street with the following conditions agreed to by the applicant following sections of the Guidelines for Historic Districts: Chapter 3, Section 3.1 – Roofs and find that there are no circumstances unique to the property:

- Replacement material to resemble the original roofing as closely as possible (GAF Slateline Shingle or similar) will be utilized.

Mr. Huber seconded the motion, which carried with unanimous support.

HDC-2024-00035
Address: 245 N. 11th Street
District: Old Fairgrounds Historic District
Owner: Pennstar Realty Group, LLC
Applicant: Corey R. Butz
Proposal: Roof replacement

Building Description:
This 2½-story brick row house, ca 1894, is Eastlake style. The lintels have incised floral and geometric motifs and the windows are 1/1 sashes. The cornice is plain, and the gabled roof has slate shingles and a single chimney.

There is a single door with a transom and projecting moldings. The foundation is faced with brickote and aluminum siding and displays two basement window grilles. The front stoop is wooden, and there is a wooden fence in the rear.

Project Description:
This application proposes to remove and dispose of the old roof and debris, install ice and water shield to the first 36 inches, and install 3-tab asphalt shingles in the slate black color.

Applicable Guidelines:

Section 3.1 – Roofs

3.1.3 Repair and restore original and historic roofing materials whenever possible. Evaluate the condition and cost of repair of original materials before removing and replacing them. Targeted areas of repair or localized in-kind replacement may be the most effective and low-cost solution.

3.1.4 Repair and replace deteriorated flashing or fasteners with materials that are compatible with the roofing material. Roof problems are often caused by failure of these components rather than the historic roofing material.

3.1.5 Preserve architectural features that give the roof its unique and building-specific character—such as dormers, turrets, chimneys, cornices, rolled ridge flashing, cresting, and finials. Repair and restore features; replace in-kind only when necessary.

3.1.6 Replace historic roofing materials in-kind whenever possible if severe deterioration makes a full replacement necessary. Replacement material should match the original in material, dimension, shape, profile, color, pattern, exposure, and overall appearance.

3.1.7 If in-kind replacement is not feasible, replace historic roofing materials with alternate materials that resemble the original as closely as possible. Roof replacement should be sensitive to the original appearance. Replacement materials should match roof slopes or shape.

3.1.8 Replace non-historic roofing materials in-kind or with recommended alternates. If the original material is documented, restoration of the original material is also an appropriate option but is not required. Original roofs may have been replaced long ago, yet asphalt shingles and similar alterations are still considered impacts to the overall appearance. Replacement materials should match the existing in color, pattern, shape, and profile. Greater flexibility is possible with non-historic roofing and using durable high-quality replacements is recommended.

3.1.9 Consider roof ventilation alternatives carefully. Ventilation options are approved on a case by case basis and can include ridge vents, louvered vents, or soffit vents. Proper ventilation may extend the life of a roofing system, but in some cases it can lead to condensation problems with long-term effects on the roofing materials and structural components. Refer to Chapter 3.8 Mechanical and Utility Equipment for related guidelines about roof vents.

3.1.36 Repair and restore gutters whenever possible. Types of repairs include repainting wood or metal surface, installing new fasteners, sealing or soldering cracks and open seams, and relining built-in box gutters with new copper sheet metal.

3.1.37 Replace existing gutters in-kind when replacement is necessary due to severe deterioration. Replicate the original construction method of a historic gutter if feasible.

3.1.38 Replace existing downspouts, scuppers, collection boxes, and other drainage elements in-kind. Appropriate alternates to in-kind replacement are round or rectangular downspouts. Smooth surfaces are encouraged over corrugated metal. In the case of decorative scuppers, replicate the profile and details as closely as possible.

3.1.39 Consider alternate materials for gutters in locations that are difficult to access for maintenance or where original materials have demonstrated a pattern of deterioration over time. A fiberglass gutter is an acceptable replacement material for a wood built-in box gutter if it matches the original in profile, size, appearance, and finish.

3.1.40 Avoid vinyl gutters due to poor durability and non-historic appearance.

3.1.41 Install new downspouts in locations that are sensitive to the architecture and will be minimally visible. Run downspouts at secondary facades and along building or porch corners when possible.

3.1.42 Paint gutters and downspouts to blend in with the building exterior. Matching the existing building trim is usually the most appropriate color selection. Copper and terne-coated stainless steel systems should be left unpainted because they weather naturally and develop a protective patina.

Observations & Comments:

It appears that the existing roof is a non-historic 3-tab asphalt shingle roof and the

proposed replacement material is an in-kind replacement. Though, it is not clear if the proposed color matches the color of the existing roofing. The guidelines indicate that replacement materials should match the existing in color, which appears to be a medium to dark grey.

Staff Recommendation:
It is recommended to approve, with conditions related to the color of the in-kind replacement material selected to better match the existing roofing.

Presenters:
- Jessica Stuck presented the application.
- Nate Cleaver represented the application.

Discussion: The applicant noted the shingle colors will match the existing and the previous owner did a lot of repairs; the front is slate with silver coat and the back is 3-tab with architectural shingles. Given the clarification of the current roofing material, GAF Slateline or similar is recommended for the front slope. Discussion was held about what should be considered in-kind given the number of roofing surfaces that exist on the roof. The applicant noted that it is an increased expense for the shingle cost as well as installation cost for the GAF Slateline shingles. The applicant noted the Slateline shingles install differently than architectural shingles and there is less to a bundle for Slateline. Given the existing conditions, it was noted that GAF Slateline or similar would be acceptable at the front and 3-Tab or Slateline will be acceptable at the back.

Action: Mr. Franzone made a motion to approve, with conditions, the application presented on May 6, 2024, for the replacement of roofing at 245 N 11th Street with the following conditions agreed to by the applicant following sections of the Guidelines for Historic Districts: Chapter 3, Section 3.1 – Roofs and find that there are no circumstances unique to the property:
- Replacement material to resemble the original roofing as closely as possible (GAF Slateline Shingle or similar) will be utilized.
- At the back slopes, if the owner chooses, in-kind replacement of 3-Tab shingles can be utilized in lieu of Slateline.
- Color to match existing roofing materials (Charcoal or similar.)

Mr. Hart seconded the motion, which carried with unanimous support.

HDC-2024-00037
Address: 421 N Church Street
District: Old Fairground Historic District
Owner: Charie Villavicencio
Applicant: Luis Guaman
Proposal: Roof replacement

Building Description:
This 2 ½ story rowhome was built in 1888 in the late Federal/Early Victorian style. The house is brick covered with brickote. It has a gabled roof with dormer, 1/1 sash windows, and a single entrance with clear transom.
Project Description:
This application proposes to remove two layers of roof shingles on the entire house (except the back lower porch), install 6 feet of ice and water shield on the eaves and 3 feet on the valleys and around the chimney, install synthetic underlayment, install new drip edge, roof boots, ridge vents, and caps, and install new GAF architectural shingles in the Pewter Grey color. This work is being done due to current leaking occurring at the roof.

Applicable Guidelines:

Section 3.1 – Roofs

3.1.3 Repair and restore original and historic roofing materials whenever possible. Evaluate the condition and cost of repair of original materials before removing and replacing them. Targeted areas of repair or localized in-kind replacement may be the most effective and low-cost solution.

3.1.4 Repair and replace deteriorated flashing or fasteners with materials that are compatible with the roofing material. Roof problems are often caused by failure of these components rather than the historic roofing material.

3.1.5 Preserve architectural features that give the roof its unique and building-specific character—such as dormers, turrets, chimneys, cornices, rolled ridge flashing, cresting, and finials. Repair and restore features; replace in-kind only when necessary.

3.1.6 Replace historic roofing materials in-kind whenever possible if severe deterioration makes a full replacement necessary. Replacement material should match the original in material, dimension, shape, profile, color, pattern, exposure, and overall appearance.

3.1.7 If in-kind replacement is not feasible, replace historic roofing materials with alternate materials that resemble the original as closely as possible. Roof replacement should be sensitive to the original appearance. Replacement materials should match roof slopes or shape.

3.1.8 Replace non-historic roofing materials in-kind or with recommended alternates. If the original material is documented, restoration of the original material is also an appropriate option but is not required. Original roofs may have been replaced long ago, yet asphalt shingles and similar alterations are still considered impacts to the overall appearance. Replacement materials should match the existing in color, pattern, shape, and profile. Greater flexibility is possible with non-historic roofing and using durable high-quality replacements is recommended.

3.1.9 Consider roof ventilation alternatives carefully. Ventilation options are approved on a case by case basis and can include ridge vents, louvered vents, or soffit vents. Proper ventilation may extend the life of a roofing system, but in some cases it can lead to condensation problems with long-term effects on the roofing materials and structural components. Refer to Chapter 3.8 Mechanical and Utility Equipment for related guidelines about roof vents.

3.1.36 Repair and restore gutters whenever possible. Types of repairs include repainting wood or metal surface, installing new fasteners, sealing or soldering cracks and open seams, and relining built-in box gutters with new copper sheet metal.

3.1.37 Replace existing gutters in-kind when replacement is necessary due to severe deterioration. Replicate the original construction method of a historic gutter if feasible.

3.1.38 Replace existing downspouts, scuppers, collection boxes, and other drainage elements in-kind. Appropriate alternates to in-kind replacement are round or rectangular downspouts. Smooth surfaces are encouraged over corrugated metal. In the case of decorative scuppers, replicate the profile and details as closely as possible.

3.1.39 Consider alternate materials for gutters in locations that are difficult to access for maintenance or where original materials have demonstrated a pattern of deterioration over time. A fiberglass gutter is an acceptable replacement material for a wood built-in box gutter if it matches the original in profile, size, appearance, and finish.

3.1.40 Avoid vinyl gutters due to poor durability and non-historic appearance.

3.1.41 Install new downspouts in locations that are sensitive to the architecture and will be minimally visible. Run downspouts at secondary facades and along building or porch corners when possible.

3.1.42 Paint gutters and downspouts to blend in with the building exterior. Matching the existing building trim is usually the most appropriate color selection. Copper and terne-coated stainless steel systems should be left unpainted because they weather naturally and develop a protective patina.

Observations & Comments:
The current architectural shingles on the roof are not historic and the proposed Timberline HDZ architectural shingles are an in-kind replacement.

Staff Recommendation:
It is recommended to approve.

Presenters:
- Jessica Stuck presented the application.
- Luis Guaman represented the application.

Discussion: The applicant noted that the owner's insurance will be canceled May 15 and the roof is currently leaking. Mr. Sadiua noted that normally the process to approve the COA is approximately 1.5 months, but Mr. Franzone noted that if approved, the emergency repairs could commence. The applicant noted there are currently 2 layers of roofing and the siding on the dormer that is coming loose will be repaired in kind. The applicant noted the color the owner requested for the replacement was GAF Weatherwood rather than Pewter Grey; Jessica noted the color should match the existing per the design guidelines. Mr. Huber noted concern about approving an architectural shingle, but it was noted that it would be acceptable to either install a 3-Tab or Slateline shingle in a dark grey color. The Applicant noted the warranty for the proposed architectural shingle was 50 years, but the 3-Tab shingle is a 25-30 year warranty.

Action: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve, with conditions, the application presented on May 6, 2024, for the replacement of roofing at 421 N Church Street with the following conditions agreed to by the applicant following sections of the Guidelines for Historic Districts: Chapter 3, Section 3.1 – Roofs and find that there are no circumstances unique to the property:
- A 3-Tab shingle or a GAF Slateline or similar shingle to match the existing color is utilized for the replacement.

Mr. Franzone seconded the motion, which carried with unanimous support.

HDC-2024-00040
Address: 1413 Linden Street
District: West Park Historic District
Owner: Alicia Moyer
Applicant: Alicia Moyer
Proposal: Roof replacement

Building Description:
This 3-story brick end of row house, ca 1905 is a Colonial Revival with multiple dwelling units. The mansard and gambrel roofs have a dormer with a quarrel upper/1 sash window, projecting eaves, a single chimney and asphalt shingles. The porch which has stonecote has a single glazed door, a picture window with transom, the pillars have classic round columns, projecting cornice with brackets, knee walls and concrete bull-nosed steps and a visible basement window grille. The bay windows are 1/1 sash with beveled glass transoms on the 2nd floor with cornice and brackets, the 1st floor is a picture window with transom.

Project Description:

This application proposes to replace the front porch roof along with the bay window roof with EPDM rubber roofing. The EPDM material is the same material that was utilized at 1411 Linden Street. The roof edge trim along the roof will be white aluminum, which will replace the existing blue metal trim.

Applicable Guidelines:
Section 3.1 – Roofs

3.1.3 Repair and restore original and historic roofing materials whenever possible. Evaluate the condition and cost of repair of original materials before removing and replacing them. Targeted areas of repair or localized in-kind replacement may be the most effective and low-cost solution.

3.1.4 Repair and replace deteriorated flashing or fasteners with materials that are compatible with the roofing material. Roof problems are often caused by failure of these components rather than the historic roofing material.

3.1.5 Preserve architectural features that give the roof its unique and building-specific character—such as dormers, turrets, chimneys, cornices, rolled ridge flashing, cresting, and finials. Repair and restore features; replace in-kind only when necessary.

3.1.6 Replace historic roofing materials in-kind whenever possible if severe deterioration makes a full replacement necessary. Replacement material should match the original in material, dimension, shape, profile, color, pattern, exposure, and overall appearance.

3.1.7 If in-kind replacement is not feasible, replace historic roofing materials with alternate materials that resemble the original as closely as possible. Roof replacement should be sensitive to the original appearance. Replacement materials should match roof slopes or shape.

3.1.8 Replace non-historic roofing materials in-kind or with recommended alternates. If the original material is documented, restoration of the original material is also an appropriate option but is not required. Original roofs may have been replaced long ago, yet asphalt shingles and similar alterations are still considered impacts to the overall appearance. Replacement materials should match the existing in color, pattern, shape, and profile. Greater flexibility is possible with non-historic roofing and using durable high-quality replacements is recommended.

3.1.9 Consider roof ventilation alternatives carefully. Ventilation options are approved on a case by case basis and can include ridge vents, louvered vents, or soffit vents. Proper ventilation may extend the life of a roofing system, but in some cases it can lead to condensation problems with long-term effects on the roofing materials and structural components. Refer to Chapter 3.8 Mechanical and Utility Equipment for related guidelines about roof vents.

3.1.36 Repair and restore gutters whenever possible. Types of repairs include repainting wood or metal surface, installing new fasteners, sealing or soldering cracks and open seams, and relining built-in box gutters with new copper sheet metal.

3.1.37 Replace existing gutters in-kind when replacement is necessary due to severe deterioration. Replicate the original construction method of a historic gutter if feasible.

3.1.38 Replace existing downspouts, scuppers, collection boxes, and other drainage elements in-kind. Appropriate alternates to in-kind replacement are round or rectangular downspouts. Smooth surfaces are encouraged over corrugated metal. In the case of decorative scuppers, replicate the profile and details as closely as possible.

3.1.39 Consider alternate materials for gutters in locations that are difficult to access for maintenance or where original materials have demonstrated a pattern of deterioration over time. A fiberglass gutter is an acceptable replacement material for a wood built-in box gutter if it matches the original in profile, size, appearance, and finish.

3.1.40 Avoid vinyl gutters due to poor durability and non-historic appearance.

3.1.41 Install new downspouts in locations that are sensitive to the architecture and will be minimally visible. Run downspouts at secondary facades and along building or porch corners when possible.

3.1.42 Paint gutters and downspouts to blend in with the building exterior. Matching the existing building trim is usually the most appropriate color selection. Copper and terne-coated stainless steel systems should be left unpainted because they weather naturally and develop a protective patina.

Observations & Comments:
The current roofing material on the porch roof is a 3-tab shingle; the current roofing material on the bay window is a flat seam metal that has been coated. Although the applicant references an adjacent property where EPDM roofing was utilized, this is not appropriate per the design guidelines. Both roofs can be seen from the public right of way; the bay window roof less so than the porch roof. An appropriate replacement would be to either replace the porch roof in-kind with 3-tab shingles or replace with an historically appropriate flat seam metal roof.
For the bay window roof, it would be appropriate to repair and recoat the flat seam metal or replace in-kind.
The metal edging material is appropriate; the color selection is not in the purview of the HARB.

Staff Recommendation:
It is recommended to approve this application with conditions:

- Replacement material either in-kind or a more historically appropriate metal.

Presenters:

- Jessica Stuck presented the application.
- Troy P. represented the application.

Discussion: The applicant noted that the adjacent properties at 1409, 1410, 1411 Linden all have the same membrane roofing that they are requesting to use on their porch roof. It was noted that the corrections will be indicated in the COA as part of the permit. The applicant asks what would happen if they did not listen to the HARB determination and installed rubber roofing. It was noted that they will be in violation and may be invited to the magistrate and face daily fines as an ongoing violation, or they may be required to replaced. The applicant's contractor, Holencik, noted they will not be able to warranty the 3-Tab material used on the low slope porch roof. It was also noted that the box gutter is lined with EPDM as well. It was asked if there was a coating or EPDM color that matches tinner's red? The representative from Holencik noted that these are not available, but there is an option to install a Duralast roof in a grey or white color. The original metal roof does not currently exist at the porch roof. It was noted that the roof is visible on the opposite side of the street, but is not very visible when you are on the same side of the street. It was noted that the EPDM warranty is a 5-year workmanship for residential; the lifespan is 15-20 years.

Action: Mr. Hart made a motion to approve, with conditions, the application presented on May 6, 2024, for the replacement of roofing at 1413 Linden Street with the following conditions agreed to by the applicant following sections of the Guidelines for Historic Districts: Chapter 3, Section 3.1 – Roofs and find that there are no circumstances unique to the property:

- The porch roof be replaced with a flat seam metal roof.
- The bay window roof should be repaired or replaced in-kind with a flat seam metal roof.

Mr. Huber seconded the motion, which carried with unanimous support.

Staff Approvals

None for April 2024

5. **Violations (see spreadsheet)**
    a. 959 W Turner (Improper signage)-Notice to be sent
    b. 1120 Linden (Improper signage)-Notice Sent-4/23/24
    c. 1147 Linden (Improper signage)-Notice Sent-4/16/24
    d. 127 N 12th (Improper railing design, Door replacement)-Notice Sent- 4/16/24
    e. 202 N 8th (Door Replacement)-Notice Sent-4/23/24

6. **Staff Reports & Other Business**

7. **Adjournment**

NEXT MEETING: Monday, June 3, 2024

Please Note:
Minutes of the Allentown Historical Architectural Review Board are presented in action format. Additional information is available in the video recording for this meeting. The recording, application materials, and staff reviews are available at the Bureau of Planning & Zoning office, 4th floor of City Hall, or by contacting historic@allentownpa.gov.