

**Historical Architectural Review Board  
COA Preliminary Review Sheet**

---

**HDC-2024-00086**

**Address: 1651 Linden Street**

**District: West Park Historic District**

**Owner: Lucy Mamadou**

**Applicant: Seifert Contracting**

**Proposal: Replace low-slope and shingle roofing.**

---

**Building Description:**

This 3-story brick twin house, ca 1911 Colonial Revival house. The gable roof has asphalt shingles, projecting cornice, a triple dormer with 1/1 sash, stone lintel and a single chimney. The 2<sup>nd</sup> floor has a bay with 1/1 sash windows and stained glass transoms, quoins from 2<sup>nd</sup> to 3<sup>rd</sup> floor and projecting cornice. The 1<sup>st</sup> floor has a picture window with stained glass transom and a single glazed door with projected moldings and a storm door. The porch has a projecting cornice, wrought iron columns on top of brick columns, brick knee wall with stone top, concrete bull-nosed steps and wrought iron railings. There is a basement window grille and a stone foundation. Most of the exterior wood has been covered with aluminum siding.

**Project Description:**

The scope of work includes removal of the existing rear low-slope roofing and installation of an EPDM rubber roof system; removal of existing shingles on the main roof and mansard, and installation of GAF Slateline shingles.



**Front Elevation (Applicant)**



**Rear Elevation (Applicant)**

**Historical Architectural Review Board  
COA Preliminary Review Sheet**

---



**Existing Main Shingle Roof (Applicant)**



**Existing Main Shingle Roof (Applicant)**



**Existing Low-Slope Roof (Applicant)**



**Existing Low-Slope Roof (Applicant)**

**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.

## Historical Architectural Review Board

### COA Preliminary Review Sheet

---

**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 proposed replacement of low-slope roofing at the rear is an in-kind replacement of an existing EPDM system, and it is not visible from the public right-of-way. The main shingle roof has existing 3-tab shingles and the proposal is to replace the shingles with GAF Slateline Weathered Slate shingles. In the submitted scope of work, the rear low-slope roof work list includes “replace the shingles on the mansard.” More information would be helpful to clarify this work item, namely, confirmation if the replacement shingles on the mansard will be GAF Slateline to match the main roof, as specified in the “upper main roof” scope of work. GAF Slateline is an appropriate shingle replacement product.

**Staff Recommendation:** After receiving clarification on the replacement shingle material of the mansard, recommend approval with the following conditions:

- The mansard replacement shingles match the main roof replacement.
-

# Historical Architectural Review Board

## COA Preliminary Review Sheet

---

### Presenters:

- Ms. Baade presented the application to HARB
- Mr. Seifert represented the application.

### Discussion:

The applicant made the following clarifications and notes on the application:

- The mansard roofing will not be replaced; the bottom two rows of existing mansard shingles will be removed to terminate the replacement EPDM roof on the low-slope portion, and the shingles will be reinstalled.
- The replacement GAF Slateline shingles will only be installed on the main roof at the third floor.
- EPDM will be installed on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor roof low-slope roof.

Mr. Jordan suggested that the second floor low slope roof is not in HARB purview, as it is not visible from a public right-of-way, and the Board agreed.

Mr. Jordan noted that he has no issue with the proposed GAF Slateline shingle replacement on the third floor roof. The Board had no opposition to the proposed replacement product.

### Action:

Mr. Hart made a motion to approve the application with no conditions. Mr. Franzone seconded the motion. Mr. Huber stated that color should be discussed before the motion is voted on, given that items with integral color are reviewable by the HARB. Mr. Hart amended his motion.

The applicant noted the color would be Antique Slate. Mr. Jordan noted that the HARB should not approve specific colors, and Mr. Huber noted that items with integral color is reviewable. The applicant noted that the existing 3-tab roof is in a brown color, but that color is not in the GAF Slateline line. Mr. Jordan noted that the issue is not with the intended color itself, but in constructing the appropriate language for the motion. Ms. Baade noted that the application materials stated the intended color was Weathered Slate, and the applicant said the correct color is Antique Slate. Mr. Jordan noted that the motion could include general language indicating grey/black tones are appropriate. Mr. Hart noted the color could be selected in context with the neighborhood and surrounding structures.

Mr. Hart made a motion to rescind his previous motion and made a new motion to approve the application presented on October 7, 2024 for replacement of roofing at 1651 Linden Street with the condition that the new roof material is in a color that is consistent within the context of the neighborhood and surrounding structures. Compliance was found with Guidelines for Historic Districts: Chapter 3, Section 3.1- Roofs and there were no circumstances unique to the property.

Mr. Franzone seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.