

**CITY OF ALLENTOWN
HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
FINAL REVIEW SHEET
August 6, 2018**

Case #HDC-2018-00023— Proposal to continue the installation of new stucco on side of house.

Property located at: 233 N 11th St.

Agenda # 1

Historic District: Old Allentown

Case # HDC-2018-00023

Meeting date: June 25, 2018

Property Owner: Stacey A Clifton

Owners Address: 233 N 11th Street,
Allentown, PA 18102

Applicant: same

Applicant's Address: same

Building description, period, style, defining features: This structure is a 2 1/2 story semi-detached row house with gable roof, front wall dormer with paired double-hung windows, projecting cornice with brackets, decorative brick band course, altered first floor window, and Eastlake style carved headers. The building dates from c. 1885 and is Eastlake Queen Anne in style. There is a single story brick and aluminum sided garage in rear of the property



Proposed alterations: It is proposed to continue the installation of new stucco on side of house.

Staff Approvals: n/a

Background: 87-30 – Applicant proposes to change non-original wood door to historically appropriate wood door, cover old window lintels above former windows on first floor, install vinyl storm windows as needed. Recommended unanimously for approval by HARB, Council approved by resolution July 15, 1987

Violations: May 2018 – Covered exposed side wall of house with new stucco.

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. **SIS 6.** Deteriorated features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture, and other visual qualities and, where possible, materials. **Allentown Guidelines for Historic Districts: Allentown Guidelines for Historic Districts:** 5. Guidelines for Existing Buildings and Structures, 1. Repairs, Replacement and Alternative Materials. 2. Historic Masonry 4. Walls, Siding and Trim 5.

Evaluation, effect on historic district, recommendations: There is no additional information from the applicant on their decision after the meeting last month. The HARB's suggested

compromise for the EIFS installation is noted in the paragraph below that summarizes the discussion at the meeting. My evaluation from last month is summarized as follows:

The proposal to retain the installation of Dryvit (EIFS) work is not historically appropriate. The EIFS panels, scoring, and changes in color detract from the historic character of the house. If the stucco was in poor condition, repair and resurfacing with new stucco would have been appropriate, but the EIFS as installed is not. The EIFS covers the character defining rake boards or the rake boards were removed to facilitate the EIFS installation, which is not historically appropriate. The EIFS's varying patterns, geometric emphasis of the gable, and simulated quoining are inappropriate and distract from the historic character of the house. It is recommended, at a minimum, to recoat the Dryvit with a single color, cut out the Dryvit at the edge of the roof and install rake boards, and fill in triangular score lines in the gable.

From June 25, 2018 meeting: Discussion: There was a lengthy discussion of the proposal to retain the Dryvit installation as completed. It was explained that Dryvit is a brand name for EIFS (Exterior Insulation Finishing System) and the applicants said the system they installed included 2" of rigid insulation and it covered the rake board. The work was done 3 years ago and at that time they had contacted City Hall to determine if they needed a permit to replace the stucco. They were told that if the work was "like for like" they did not need a permit. The HARB explained that the installation was not "like for like" and should have had HARB review and approval. Mr. Brobst, Ms. Jackson, and Mr. Huber verbally concurred that they could not support retaining the EIFS installation with the current score and color pattern. Mr. Sharon Smith, a neighbor, argued for retaining the EIFS installation. She said there were many violations on the street and didn't understand why her neighbor was being singled out for her violation. She mentioned several locations where she thought EIFS was installed. Mr. Kimmerly said he would check those mentioned, in particular, the laundromat at 11th and Turner.

The Historic Consultant's recommended treatment of the existing installation was discussed but the contractor who installed the EIFS said it would be expensive and difficult to execute. Several other ideas were forwarded. It was suggested that the EIFS be painted a single color. Mr. Huber pointed out that the areas of the darker color, which were less than the lighter color, could be painted to match the lighter color. It was also decided that the dark color could remain at the base of the wall. The applicant and installer expressed unhappiness with any recommendation.

In conclusion it was decided to table the case to allow the applicant to consider the options recommended. There was adequate time from the date of submission for the case to be acted upon at the next regularly scheduled HARB meeting on August 6.

Motion: The HARB upon motion by Ms. Roberts and seconded by Mr. Fillman agreed to table the project to give the applicant time to consider the options recommended by the HARB.

The proposal to table was unanimously approved. (6-0; motion carried; Brobst, Fillman, Huber, Jackson, Roberts, Sell.)

Discussion: The applicant informed the HARB that she would paint the EIFS that was installed on the house without HARB review or COA. This was a compromise recommendation from last month's meeting as noted above. The color will be either the lighter color or the darker color.

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

1. The proposal to continue the installation of new stucco (EIFS) on side of house at 233 N 11th Street was presented by Stacey and Willie Clifton.
2. The EIFS on the side of the house may be retained if painted entirely in one color.

3. The EIFS will be painted either the darker or lighter color.
The proposal to recommend a COA was unanimously approved. (4-0; motion carried; Brobst, Fillman, Huber, Roberts)