MINUTES

**HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**June 3, 2019**

**THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. CITY GOVERNMENT CENTER**

**PUBLIC SAFETY AUDITORIUM, ROOM 213**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Andrew Knee, Chair

 Trina Gribble, Vice Chair

 Anne Montgomery, Assistant Codes Administrator

 Camille Bennett

 Jeremiah Chamberlin

 Neil Heffelfinger

 April Rucker (Arrived at 6:10 PM)

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** N/A

**STAFF PRESENT:** Frank Grumbine, Historic Preservation Specialist and Archivist

 Tiffanie Baldock, Senior Deputy City Solicitor

**OTHERS PRESENT:** See attendance signature sheet

**CALL TO ORDER: 6:02 PM**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Mrs. Bennett motioned, and Mrs. Montgomery seconded the motion, to Approve the April 1st minutes. Mrs. Bennett motioned, and Mr. Chamberlin seconded the motion to Approve the May 6th minutes. The Board approved the motion to Approve minutes from the April and May meetings by unanimous vote (6-0).

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**1. 2015 North 2nd Street, filed by Wendell Hoover was tabled at the May 6, 2019 HARB meeting. To replace the existing wooden windows that were damaged during a fire at an adjacent property with Interstate Building Materials Architectural Series acrylic windows.**

The case was represented by Wendell Hoover, 2910 Parkside Lane Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mr. Knee asked Mr. Grumbine whether or not there had been updates since the last month on the case. Mr. Grumbine replied that there were no updates. Mr. Knee gave a brief overview of the case and stated that the new windows were installed due to the adjacent fire at the property next door. Mr. Knee stated that it is an after the fact review and the HARB board members needed more information on the product to make a determination on the matter. Mr. Knee said that the members had a meeting with Historic Harrisburg Association regarding the issue of windows in an open-ended discussion.

Mr. Knee asked the Applicant whether he had anything to add. The Applicant had given the board members a letter from the manufacturer stating that the windows can be painted as well as a list of historic properties that had the proposed product installed. The Applicant handed out another document stating that the windows were installed in an historic district in Connecticut. The Applicant said that he only received one email regarding the use of the proposed windows in historic structures. The Applicant goes on to state that some uses were in commercial applications and one is a hotel, where many are historic buildings over 100 years old.

Mr. Knee said that the board had the discussion about the paintability of the proposed windows and states that there is a letter from the manufacturer stating that painting the window does not void the warranty. Mr. Knee said that he’s not sure if this satisfies the conditions that the board had set the prior month. Mr. Chamberlin states that the board was looking for several conditions, one being any evidence from historic districts or previous owners in how the windows held up, if the windows are paintable, and the profile of the windows and how they look on the building. Mr. Chamberlin stated that each board member was able to form their own opinion based these factors and that the only unanswered conditions is how the windows hold up over time on historic structures.

Mr. Knee said that one of the issues is that HARB board members are updating their standards and historic guidelines where they were able to talk to various entities in trying to determine what metrics or standards they should apply to windows in the historic districts. Mr. Knee said that people that may be unaware of the HARB review process have installed these windows and that the board needs to perform more research before determining specific metrics for windows. Mr. Knee stated that the board is up against whether or not they should approve the windows and set a precedent going forward and stated that he is personally struggling with the question but can’t speak for the board. Mr. Chamberlin asked Mr. Knee if he means by setting a precedent that the window meets certain criteria, therefore it would be okay. Mr. Knee confirms that is the case and said that the board has approved various materials because they are working to find lower cost windows in historic districts and would really like to make that happen. The Applicant noted that any approved windows should be longer lasting. Mr. Knee stated that there are future discussions to be had to determine to update the standards.

Mr. Knee asked whether anyone from public had comments on the project; David Morrison from Historic Harrisburg Association stated that he has offered to help look into the broad question of windows in historic districts. He stated that he already had received some answers from others in the preservation quorum, but nothing substantial. Mr. Morrison stated that at some point some useful information to share with the HARB from other cities, but at the moment he stated that HHA cannot take a specific stance without further information.

Mrs. Rucker asked if the proposed product are lower cost windows and asked Mr. Knee about what he meant about using lower cost windows in historic districts. Mr. Chamberlin replied that he meant vis-à-vis wood windows. Mr. Knee said that he’s open to any solution that meets their future criteria just that there are more options. The Applicant stated that he can speak about how wood windows are more expensive across the board and that the proposed windows are not cheap windows but are longer lasting. The Applicant further stated that people in historic districts know that they have to use wood windows, then use the cheapest wood windows possible but then five years later they don’t hold up because they’re the cheapest of the wood windows. Mr. Knee stated that the board had that conversation with HHA about cheap wood windows. The Applicant stated that he is just looking for windows that are longer lasting and when new buyers purchase a house the windows are barely functioning and they have to replace them when the windows have not been installed very long. The Applicant stated that in our price point its very hard to pass that cost on because the housing stock is not worth as much. Mr. Knee asked to take the temperature of the board.

Mr. Chamberlin said that he doesn’t think that the board should penalize applicants if they don’t already have criteria. He said that he agreed with Mr. Knee about how they don’t have a defined policy in place. Mr. Chamberlin said he understands and that he has priced wood windows across the board and knows how much they cost. He said that besides roofs one of the problems with buildings laying fallow are windows, so having a quality window even if the building falls on hard times can be preserved. Without specific metrics its difficult to pass it onto the Applicant. Mr. Chamberlin states that he’s not sure from a legal perspective whether if approved that would set a precedent moving forward. Mr. Knee stated that they discussed that for previous test cases and he felt it is best to not create more pockets of uncertainly and to tamp down what is acceptable and what is not. Mr. Chamberlin asked if this is a test case then it would be only this application and stated that historically they applied test cases with specific materials or manufacturers and that test cases need to be specifically defined. Mr. Knee said that in the process of developing standards they have a recommendation from the Planning Bureau to deny the application for the reasons that the board has not previously approved the material. He also said that they have determined that it is best to follow the guidelines of the Secretary of Interior Standards, and based on that guidance he struggled to approve the windows.

Mrs. Gribble said that the board is working towards metrics in the evolution of materials in windows. She said that the metrics as of now are wood and stated that it’s the precedent and criteria that they have been using and until the board goes through the process of determining specific metrics for different types of wood windows such as sight lines and divided lites. She said that the windows that are proposed by the Applicant are not as offensive because they are one-over-one. Mr. Chamberlin stated that if they were simulated divided lites then he would have issues with them. Mrs. Gribble said it makes it a harder case and she is glad that they can be painted so they can be contextual with the area, she said she struggles with the timing of the issue of windows.

Mr. Knee asked Tiffanie Baldock whether the board can approve the Applicant without setting legal precedent given the board is in a transitional period as a condition set in without precedent. Mrs. Baldock said that if they want to approve it without precedent then why not approve it as a test case. Mr. Knee said that the board is unsure of test-case longevity and not sure where that line falls while they update the guidelines. Mrs. Baldock stated that they would have to put some kind of specification of why this is a special case and why it would differ from anyone else that would come in with a similar product. Mr. Chamberlin asked Mr. Knee whether he meant how long a test case would last in terms of precedent setting. Mr. Knee said he’s asking because there seems like an appetite to approve from the board and said that he’s leaning towards denial because that is the recommendation from the Planning Bureau. Mr. Knee said that he’s interested in seeing if anyone is interested in moving that route and whether taking a vote to see where it falls. Mrs. Baldock said if they did approve it as a test case and meanwhile developed new guidelines and the product falls within the range of new specifications then they could pull it out of test case status.

Mr. Chamberlin asked Mr. Grumbine to read the recommendation from the Planning Bureau. Mr. Grumbine stated the the proposed replacement windows feature materials (specialty polymer and acrylic resins) that are not an historically contextual or compatible material, and do not feature any wooden material on the exterior of the window, as opposed to other products that HARB has reviewed and approved in the past (such as Fibrex). Mr. Grumbine said that HARB has consistently denied the use of such material in replacing historic elements such as windows. Mr. Grumbine said that the information provided by the Applicant does not indicate that the material can be painted without voiding the warranty and without requiring special treatments, but the Applicant did provide evidence that this is not the case and in fact the windows can be painted without voiding the warranty. Mr. Grumbine also stated the Applicant has other material options for replacing the existing windows such as wooden windows, which would be in-kind replacements, or the use of wood composite materials which HARB has approved in the past.

Mr. Chamberlin said that he thinks the silence of the board means they don’t want to say no. Mrs. Gribble said she doesn’t want to say yes either. Mr. Chamberlin said that the board can’t say maybe and has to decide either way. Mr. Knee said if someone is interested in creating a motion to approve with conditions, and if there is no interest then the board can vote on the denial. Mr. Chamberlin said he’s interested in this being a test case but wanted to determine what that meant because a test case would not be determining a specific material, but a manufacturer, therefore a test case would be difficult. Mr. Chamberlin said that the test case would be that any acrylic or vinyl windows that can be painted and replicate historic sight lines with a proper inset and proper size. Mr. Chamberlin said that if he were defining design guides for windows that they would need to sit inside the existing casing and that the frame of the window sits inside of the original, original sash openings, the profile on the exterior of the windows of the glazing, and would need to be paintable certified by the manufacturer like the Applicant provided. Mr. Chamberlin said if he were approving of a test case then this is how he would envision it in the future.

Mr. Knee said if it were approved as a test case with those conditions then it would have to be reviewed on a schedule within six months or a year. Mr. Chamberlin said that he would like to see them during the summer and the winter because of vinyl windows react with thermal expansion. Mr. Knee said to do a test case for a year for reasons that he would like to see how they hold up while the board works on the guidelines and the board received notice that the windows can be painted. Mrs. Gribble asked if the board is requiring the windows to be painted. Mr. Chamberlin said that painting the windows would a condition for approval. Mr. Knee asked the Applicant whether he would be able to meet that condition. The Applicant said “sure.” Mr. Knee said they can’t regulate color and Mr. Chamberlin said just match the house.

Mrs. Gribble said as per the Secretary of Interior Standards the proposed window is not a historic material. She said it doesn’t feel the same, doesn’t look the same and said that the board sees a lot of windows and would hate for it to become a norm. Mr. Knee said that that’s why the board is working so hard to update the standards. Mr. Knee asked Mr. Grumbine to restate the conditions that Mr. Chamberlin stated. Mr. Grumbine said that the conditions would be that the test case would be within one year and that the windows would have to be painted. Mr. Chamberlin added that other conditions would be from a design perspective including sash size and lite configuration, he said that would not be a condition for approval for this case, but in those would be design conditions for the future. Mr. Knee said that this would be a non-precedent setting approval and asked if there is a motion for it.

Mr. Chamberlin moved, and Mr. Rucker seconded the motion, to Approve as a test case with conditions as stated.

The vote was split as there was dissent in the initial vote. Mr. Knee asked Mr. Grumbine to do a roll call vote. The votes cast were as follows: AJ Knee, no. Trina Gribble, no. Anne Montgomery, no. April Rucker, yes. Camille Bennett, no. Jeramiah Chamberlin, yes. Neil Heffelfinger, yes.

The motion was Denied by a majority vote (4-3).

Mr. Grumbine said the Nays have it. Mr. Knee said unfortunately this case has been denied. Mr. Chamberlin said that this is the board recommendation to the City Council and the Applicant can appeal to the Council. The Applicant said if he were going to replace the several windows that need it which would be about three windows. Mr. Chamberlin said the Applicant can replace them with wood and resubmit it to the Planning Bureau and said the other windows on the side of the building would be prior precedent that were not exposed previously. Mr. Grumbine asked Mr. Chamberlin to clarify if that would be a grandfathered right-of-way clause. The Applicant said that previously the buildings were inches apart. Mr. Chamberlin said that if the windows were not previously visible from a public right-of-way then they are grandfathered in. The Applicant stated that he does not have time to wait any longer he has to move on. Mr. Knee apologized and said that the case has been denied.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

1. **117 Washington Street, filed by Stephen Clipper, to replace an existing wood door with a new fiberglass door.**

Mr. Grumbine gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved with Conditions. The conditions were that:

1. The Applicant shall confirm from the manufacturer that painting or finishing the door will not void the warranty
2. Original materials or other character defining features including the transom shall not be altered if new door is installed.
3. New door hardware shall be of high quality and compatible with the door color.

The case was represented by Stephen Clipper, 117 Washington Street Harrisburg, PA 17104 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mr. Knee asked the Applicant whether he had anything to add to the case report. The Applicant stated that it’s fabulous and that the door will add to the period concept of the house and that it is an antique home. The Applicant stated that he goes to work to pay for this house, he goes to work to clean this house, and he is going to croak in this house. The Applicant asked to please approve the door.

 Mr. Knee asked for comments from the board. Mr. Chamberlin asked about the lite pattern of the door and whether the photo included with the invoice is representative of what the door will look like. The Applicant stated that the door is supposed to look like mahogany grain wood and has a six paneled window. The Applicant said that the door is high quality and very expensive and said would buy a better door if needed. The Applicant also said it is in desperate need of repair and had a contractor come to repair the vestibule and that the existing door is not flush which allows moisture into the home.

Mr. Chamberlin asked the Applicant whether he will be replacing the frame. The Applicant responded that the door is pre-hung. Mr. Knee reiterated the conditions from the Planning Bureau to the Applicant and asked whether they were conditions that he could meet. The Applicant responded “yes.”

Mr. Knee asked whether anyone from public had comments on the project; there were no comments.

Ms. Rucker moved, Mrs. Bennett seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (7-0).

1. **700 North 3rd Street, filed by Sprocket Mural Works, to paint a mural on a brick wall on Oliver Alley.**

Mr. Grumbine gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved for the following reasons.

1. The mural will activate a large, blank wall which faces an array of parking lots. The wall exhibits no historically- or architectural-defining features and the mural will beautify the area.
2. The immediate setting of the wall has been severely compromised where little historic integrity exists. Any type of beautification would develop a sense of place and progression in the immediate area.

The case was represented by Megan Caruso with Sprocket Mural Works (the contractor), 2036 Green Street Harrisburg, PA 17102 (“aka the Applicant”).

Mr. Knee asked whether the Applicant had anything to add to the proposal. The Applicant stated that they were looking at this particular wall for placemaking and that it faces parking lots which is next to Stallion’s and is behind a row of restaurants. The Applicant said that there are a lot of people who use this space for parking and in terms of content it will be a mural about diversity in the City.

Mr. Knee said that he knows that the board has done plenty of murals with Sprocket Mural Works before and was asking whether they have changed their painting method at all. The Applicant said that their organization is modeled after Philadelphia Mural Arts and all the paint that they use is breathable and if any moisture is introduced the paint won’t damage the integrity of the brick. The Applicant also said the paint is very high quality, heavily pigmented, and will last decades, and that the paint is very expensive.

 Mr. Knee asked whether there were any comments from the board. Mr. Chamberlin said that historically there always has been a condition for the paint to be breathable and wanted that condition to included moving forward for anything approved.

Mr. Knee asked whether anyone from public had comments on the project; there were no comments.

Mr. Chamberlin moved, Mrs. Rucker seconded the motion, to Approve with Additional Conditions. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (7-0).

**3. 1316 North 3rd Street, filed by Sprocket Mural Works, to paint a mural on a brick wall on Sayford Street.**

Mr. Grumbine gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved for the following reasons.

1. The mural will activate a large, blank wall which faces a parking lot. The wall exhibits no historically- or architecturally-defining features and has little historic integrity.

2. The mural will beautify the area and will be a placemaking feature of the district.

1. The wall has been a continual target for graffiti and the mural would likely deter such activity.

The case was represented by Megan Caruso with Sprocket Mural Works (the contractor), 2036 Green Street Harrisburg, PA 17102 (“aka the Applicant”).

Mr. Knee asked the Applicant whether he had anything to add the case report. The Applicant stated that the wall is on Sayford Alley and said that it has been a target for graffiti and it is known that murals deflect graffiti. The Applicant stated that many of the windows have been filled with various types of brick or boarded up and said that it is not a very attractive wall. The Applicant said that in the future she would like to try and shutdown the street to make it into a pocket park and the first step is to have a mural. Mr. Heffelfinger asked the Applicant whether the mural will be confined by the dimensions of 14x40 feet shown on the proposal. The Applicant said those are the minimum dimensions that they can afford but would like for the mural to continue further back further down the street in the future. The Applicant stated that the height restrictions are because of the powerlines and the safe distance from them is about ten feet and that she could not get approval to shut off the power.

Mr. Heffelfinger asked whether the bricks above the proposed mural site would remain brick. The Applicant replied correct and said someone would have to be very ambitious to apply graffiti above the mural and said that she would like for the mural be 14 high the entire way down the wall. Mr. Knee asked if it would be helpful to add a condition to approve the entire wall for a mural expansion in the future. Mr. Knee asked whether the Applicant would have to come back in for another COA application for that in the future or if she could skip the HARB process. Mr. Chamberlin said if they approve the entire wall, then it would be approved indefinitely. Mr. Knee said two conditions for Approval would be the paint must be breathable and that the entire wall would be approved for a mural.

Mr. Knee asked whether anyone from public had comments on the project; there were no comments.

Mr. Chamberlin noted that weren’t any conditions from the Planning Bureau. The Applicant stated that she always uses the same paint. Mr. Chamberlin said that it’s not just for the Applicant but to set precedent going forward and to maintain consistency.

Mrs. Gribble moved, and Mr. Chamberlin seconded the motion, to Approve with Additional Conditions. The motion was adopted with a unanimous vote (7-0).

**4. 1122 North 3rd Street, filed by Chris Dawson to perform extensive rehabilitation including: major fenestration reconfiguration in courtyard and on rear of building, replace rubber roofs in-kind, replace asphalt roofs with metal, install terra cotta paneling in courtyard, install stair tower with skylight, install oven flue, paint brick on primary façade, replace missing or broken glass in-kind, replace rooftop deck.**

Mr. Grumbine gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved with the following conditions:

1. The replacement windows will be made of a paintable material such as Fibrex, Azek, Ultrex, or wood and have simulated divided lites with real or false muntins rather than the proposed aluminum.
2. The Applicant will work with the City Engineer to install a curb cut, driveway, and an ADA-compliant sidewalk for the rear garage on Susquehanna Street.
3. If removal of original granite curbs on Susquehanna Street is required, the Applicant must coordinate with Historic Harrisburg Association and the Planning Bureau for their storage and reuse.
4. The Applicant will use infill brick and paint on the courtyard façades rather than the proposed terra cotta paneling.
5. The Applicant will work with Planning Bureau prior to finalizing the courtyard grounds and surfaces for future use.

The case was represented by Chris Dawson (the contractor), 300 North 2nd Street Harrisburg, PA 17101 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mr. Chamberlin asked the Applicant whether this was the same property he applied for two years ago. The Applicant said yes. Mr. Chamberlin said he recalled approving aluminum windows for the courtyard due to the justification that the windows would not be visible from the street. Mr. Chamberlin asked the Applicant whether there were porches on the interior courtyard. The Applicant replied that it did. Mr. Chamberlin asked whether they were demolished now. The Applicant stated that they were. The Applicant said that they were not visible from the public way. Mr. Chamberlin disagreed and said right now they would be without the previously proposed fence.

Mr. Knee asked the Applicant whether he had any general comments. The Applicant said they got approval two years ago. The Applicant said the owner was present at the meeting and had a change of heart to develop a non-profit rather than use the property as a personal residence. The Applicant stated that the non-profit was a community centered program including a pay what you can restaurant and transitional housing for female veterans as well as a community resource room. The Applicant further stated that many of the aspects of the project are taking shape and that his intent with the new changes to the exterior hoped would be simpler and more attractive from a HARB perspective. The Applicant said that previously they had an extensive discussion about the proposed changes on the rear façade and had the proposal and previous drawings from two years ago. The Applicant said as a non-profit that the rear façade was simplified and stripped down and said it triggered some changes such as public needs of egress stairs in the back in the alley.

The Applicant stated that there have been no changes to 1122 North 3rd Street, the character defining features and that his strategy has not changed at all. The Applicant said that with the restaurant piece being in the back of the courtyard, now there would be a more public access point into the courtyard and that the courtyard design is still being developed in that the floor elevations and ADA access is still being worked through. The Applicant said that he would see a deck on the north side of the building closer to the building itself and then would work with a landscape architect to develop a garden on the other half of it to develop some screening with grasses but not hard fencing. The Applicant stated that it is a separate application but would see some type of signage piece for the courtyard to indicate the location of the restaurant in the back but have not designed anything. Mr. Chamberlin said that would need to be applied for. The Applicant replied “sure, sure.”

The Applicant said that based on the staff recommendations, in regard to the terra cotta paneling. that the client has an interest in energy performance and with the terra cotta paneling the building could get a better performing skin for energy efficiency in the less visible portions of the courtyard. The Applicant said that in the packet he admits that the terra cotta shown is a rust color and stated that HARB doesn’t get involved in colors but the thinking has evolved on the color of the terra cotta. The Applicant stated that the color would be more sedate and probably like a grey due to noticing the tones of grey in the copper elements on the building. The Applicant said that he does not want to compete too much with the front building and would make the terra cotta more subtle in the back.

Ms. Rucker asked the Applicant of the location of the proposed aluminum windows in the design. The Applicant replied they will be on the interior courtyard as well as a couple openings in the back on the alley.

Mr. Knee asked whether the Applicant is proposing a simple aluminum garage door. The Applicant confirmed and said it is the same design from two years ago. Mr. Knee said he is fine with the garage door as long as it is not pressed aluminum.

Mr. Knee and Ms. Rucker asked about material and location of the windows on the rear façade. The Applicant said on the lower level there will be a garage door, a couple man doors, and said the offices for the non-profit will be on the second floor and is looking to install new windows there. The Applicant said that he greatly simplified the design of the back and was being aggressive with the previous design.

Mr. Knee asked the board of what they think about the terra cotta material and said his first thought is that he does not feel that it is a necessary condition and is fine with the material as stated. Mr. Chamberlin asked if the rear addition is composed of cinder block. The Applicant said that he’s wondering if there are any contributory features of that façade. Mr. Chamberlin asked the Applicant about the material of the terra cotta. The Applicant said you can get them in different sizes but haven’t fully designed it yet and that it’s a beautiful material and it locks together as a rain screen. Mr. Knee asked if it a veneer, and the Applicant confirmed as such. The Applicant said that last time he got approval for a rooftop deck and that is not in the equation anymore.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that the board just denied a window material that was not paintable and said previously the aluminum windows were approved due to the fact they would not be visible from the public. Mr. Chamberlin voiced his concern that this needs to be addressed and stated that they either need to agree with the Planning Bureau or define how much screening is necessary to shield the area from the public right of way.

Mr. Knee said that they had the conversation of the materiality of windows for certain architectural styles and stated that the back structure does have historic elements. The Applicant stated that it is very difficult to see the rear connecting piece from the public view with or without a fence. Mr. Knee said that it is fair to use different window standards for this type of structure. Mrs. Gribble asked about the ages of the structures and Mr. Grumbine replied that the rear addition was built in 1955 and the original structure was built around 1890.

Mr. Knee inquired about the original primary structure and the proposed changes to the windows. The Applicant replied that they will repair and maintain the original windows. Mr. Knee said he likes the design as proposed and remove conditions one and four. Mr. Knee asked Mrs. Baldock if the board has to place another condition as proposed if they were to remove a condition. Mrs. Baldock said no new condition is necessary, it would be as proposed.

Mr. Knee asked whether anyone from public had comments on the project; there were no comments.

Mr. Chamberlin expressed his concern about staying with precedent in a meeting where they just voted down an applicant for not meeting Secretary of Interior Standards. He said how can the board veto the first applicant and approve this one without a matrix and that the board is applying different standards in the exact same meeting. Mr. Knee said this building is a different age than the previous case. Mrs. Gribble stated that the board previously approved the aluminum windows based on the fact that they were not visible from public right of way. Mrs. Rucker noted that there is no fence being proposed anymore therefore the windows will be visible. Mr. Chamberlin noted that there will be a restaurant, therefore the courtyard is made to be publicly used.

Mr. Heffelfinger asked the Applicant about the size of the window in the courtyard. The Applicant stated that he is not changing the size of the openings. Mrs. Gribble asked what type of windows are in the courtyard on the connector piece. The Applicant said they are wood windows. Mrs. Gribble asked if the board could approve aluminum windows on the rear and wood windows for the connector piece. Mr. Chamberlin said that would be a bad design and that he would rather have a good design than follow the rules. Mrs. Montgomery asked the Applicant which is more visible from the street. The Applicant replied the modern addition is more visible and that he would rather have a unified design in the courtyard.

Mr. Knee asked the board about how they feel about the terra cotta and whether they should remove the Planning Bureau condition. Mr. Knee recited the Planning Bureau’s recommendation regarding the windows and feels that it should be removed due to the different age of the structure. Mrs. Bennett said she agrees with the current condition. Mr. Chamberlin asked Mrs. Baldock whether if a building that is not historic should follow with historic materials. Mrs. Baldock replied that she recalls the Board turning down aluminum windows for other non-historic buildings. Mr. Grumbine stated that historicism is subjective and that just because a building is not historic now doesn’t mean that it won’t be historic in the future.

Mr. Knee reiterated whether the board should remove the condition from the Planning Bureau regarding the infill brick. Mr. Chamberlin asked the Applicant whether he would be willing to utilize that material. The Applicant responded that he would prefer not to.

Mrs. Gribble added that the project is a rehabilitation as opposed to the previous application which was a restoration, therefore if the board allows for terra cotta then why not the aluminum windows. Mr. Chamberlin said if the board is not going to approve the aluminum windows then they should not approve the terra cotta and that the board needs to maintain consistency. Mrs. Gribble asked if the board is differentiating between restoration and rehabilitation. Mr. Knee confirmed and believes so based on the fact that it is a rehabilitation and redesign. Mrs. Gribble said that the primary façade of the historic structure is being maintained. Mrs. Bennett stated that she would leave conditions one and four in if approved.

Mr. Heffelfinger asked about the driveway and the Applicant said that they are proposing to put a curb cut in the back but reinstall the curb in the front.

Mr. Chamberlin moved with the exception of conditions one and four, Mrs. Montgomery seconded the motion to Approve with Staff Conditions two, three, and five.

There was dissent in the initial vote, therefore, Mr. Knee asked Mr. Grumbine to take a roll call vote. The vote was as follows. Aj Knee, aye. Trina Gribble, yes. Anne Montgomery, yes. April Rucker, yes. Camille Bennett, no. Jerimiah Chamberlin, yes. Neil Heffelfinger, yes.

The motion was adopted with a majority vote (6-1).

The Applicant asked Mr. Grumbine to repeat the conditions. Mr. Grumbine said that the Board is removing conditions one and four and leaving conditions two, three, and five.

 **5. 105 Calder Street** filed by Chris Dawson to perform exterior work including: Replace the front steps and porch, replace the rear/side fence, replace all windows with wood windows. Replace the rear porch with steps and adding a window to the west elevation on the 3rd floor. Replacing the 3rd floor south facing window, door, and brick to the rooftop deck with glass entranceway including new glass guardrails.

Mr. Grumbine gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved with the following conditions:

1. Upon removal of front porch, the newly exposed front basement window shall have a period correct window grate installed to match the existing grate.
2. New front steps shall be composed of a monolithic stone material such as brownstone or granite.
3. The proposed fence that will replace the existing contemporary fence shall abide by the applicable regulations in the Zoning Code and be painted or stained.
4. New wood windows shall have a lite pattern that matches the original. One-over-one for the primary façade and two-over-two for the secondary and tertiary façades. New windows must be painted to match the color palette of the structure.
5. Proposed new fenestrations for the entryway shall be composed of a non-vinyl window product made of metal construction.
6. The new rooftop deck above the third floor shall not be in the direct pedestrian sight-line from Calder Street and minimally visible from Bartine Street. A mockup (or flags) must be used prior to construction to test sight lines and visibility. The new deck will abide by the Zoning Code.

The case was represented by Chris Dawson (the contractor), 300 North 2nd Street Harrisburg, PA 17101, and Kali Tennis (the owner), 106 Calder Street Harrisburg, PA 17102 (aka “the Applicants”).

Mr. Knee asked whether the applicant had anything to add. The Applicant stated that he had passed out additional materials including a comparison of windows, documentation of porches, and an updated rendering of the rear of the building. The Applicant stated that he was interested in Wendell’s discussion about windows because he was talking with Mr. Grumbine about an alternative window product and couldn’t see a path to approval. The Applicant said that due to this they are using insulated wooden windows and also stated that they were looking at triple insulated polymer windows. The Applicant stated that individuals in historic districts are looking for energy efficient windows. The Applicant said that their initial submission was the proposed insulated wood windows and that the existing windows are vinyl.

The Applicant states that Mr. Grumbine had some issues with the steps being replaced and wanted to give more context to the proposed design and material. The Applicant wanted to do something potentially with concrete or cast stone to show off the original façade. The Applicant also said a change to the original submission from the glass guardrails and wanted to change to a rope guardrail system due to aviary health.

Mr. Knee inquired about the design of the rope guardrail system and the Applicant responded that it will be a simple design whereas compared to more complex versions. The Applicant stated that there is a deck on the 2nd story and proposed to replace the existing openings out to the deck to get more natural light into the 3rd floor. The Applicant said that he wants to introduce a introduce a third-floor window on the west façade and stated there is plenty of precedent on other nearby buildings for the window. The Applicant said that the concerns that Mr. Grumbine had about the visibility of the new rooftop deck and said that he’s fully confident that the deck would not be visible from Calder Street at all.

Mr. Chamberlin inquired about the Planning Bureau’s condition regarding the new rooftop deck and whether it suggests that it should not be visible from Calder Street. Mr. Grumbine concurred and stated that it is common practice as per the Secretary of Interior Standards to install a mock-up to test sight lines and visibility when installing a new addition on a rooftop. Mr. Knee said if a deck were to be installed and it could be visible from Calder Street then we would have some issues. The Applicant stated it is a modest design and is simple and small.

Mr. Knee asked the Board of their initial thoughts on material. Mr. Chamberlin asked the Applicant about the renderings and the apparent elimination of the basement windows in them. The Applicant replied that they were focusing on modeling the steps and forgot to include the basement windows and that it was not intentional and that the windows will remain. Mr. Chamberlin asked whether the Applicant could meet the condition that they install a similar window grate once the porch is removed. Mr. Knee proposed altering the condition to simply match a period grate rather than the existing grate. The Applicant said that the opening under the stoop is a coal chute and that 107 and 105 Calder are the only two houses on the block that have that type of stoop. The Applicant said that all the houses either have both their grates or neither of them and stated when the stoop is removed then the original basement window will be exposed. Mr. Chamberlin said when that window is newly exposed then it should have a matching grate.

Betsy Dum, 113 Calder Street Harrisburg, PA 17102, said that not all windows have the grates on the block and that she purchased her existing grates years ago and are not original. Mr. Knee asked the Applicant where they were going with the design of the basement windows. The Applicant said they are still in the design process and an intern unintentionally forgot to include the basement windows in the project rendering. The Applicant stated that when she applied for a COA that she does not remember there being grates in the basement windows at 106 Calder Street and replaced them with hopper windows. Mr. Knee said the grates don’t exist on every historic structure so he thinks to match the existing grate or add a condition that the grate is reused. He would modify condition one so that the newly exposed window would utilize period sensitive windows for the basement. The Applicant said that it is difficult to find wood windows to match the existing opening. Mr. Knee said that they would have to use the same historic materials. Mrs. Gribble clarified that the basement windows will match the material of the adjacent windows. Mr. Knee said that the Board should add a condition that should the Applicant remove the grate then its reuse should be coordinated with Historic Harrisburg Association and Planning Bureau.

Mrs. Gribble read the second condition that the Applicant shall use monolithic stone such as brownstone or granite for the front porch. The Applicant said they were thinking about concrete or cast stone. Mr. Knee asked about railing and the Applicant said that railing is needed under thirty inches and said that there is railing on the east of the existing porch. Mr. Chamberlin asked the Applicant whether the existing wall between porches would remain and the Applicant replied that it would remain. Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant whether their application referred to the concrete and the Applicant stated that the application just stated a new front porch. Mr. Chamberlin said that it would have to be in a condition since the material was not included in the original plans and can be added to condition two.

Mr. Knee asked the Board whether they had issues with the fence being replaced. The Applicant stated that eventually the fence may be replaced to install storage areas for trash containers and uniformity.

Mr. Knee recited condition four and stated that the second half of the condition must be removed due to the fact that HARB cannot have legal authority over color. Mr. Knee asked the Board if they are fine with the rest of the condition. The Applicant asked about the sash configuration from the condition and Mr. Grumbine said that the existing vinyl windows are one-over-one. The Applicant said that he’s only seen one-over-one windows on adjacent properties. Mr. Chamberlin said that he would change the condition in order for the new windows to remain the same sash configuration. Mr. Knee said they should remove the second sentence of the condition in its entirety. Mr. Knee restated the revised condition as new wood windows shall have a lite pattern that matches original and new windows must be painted.

Mr. Knee read the fifth condition to the Board and Mr. Chamberlin asked Mr. Grumbine for an explanation on the condition. Mr. Grumbine said that the Secretary Standards for Rehabilitation state that new construction on secondary or tertiary facades shall be composed of contemporary materials to demonstrate current architectural styles. The Applicant said that he would want to use accent colors for the new construction in the back against original materials. The Applicant stated that he was planning on using wood. Mr. Knee said he would remove the second half of that condition. Mr. Chamberlin said the drawings are a bit ambiguous and lacking materiality. Mr. Knee stated that the condition to change what HARB does for most windows such as wood or Fibrex.

Mr. Knee reiterated the condition six in that the new rooftop deck won’t be visible from Calder Street, which was already discussed. The Applicant asked about whether the Board was ok with the newly proposed rope guardrail instead of the initial glass guardrail. Mr. Knee and Mr. Chamberlin confer that there should be a new condition. Mr. Knee asked the Board whether they have a problem with the wire rope. There was no dissent. Mr. Knee said that it should be condition that the material for the guardrail shall be glass or wire rope as presented.

Mr. Knee asked whether anyone from public had comments on the project; Betsy Dum said that she would suggest approval because they are great neighbors.

Mr. Knee asked Mr. Grumbine to review all the updated and revised conditions. Mr. Grumbine read them as follows.

Upon removal of the front porch the newly exposed basement window will match newly installed adjacent window should the grate be removed. If existing grate is removed, it’s storage and reuse will be coordinated with HHA and the Planning Bureau.

New front steps shall be composed of monolithic materials such as concrete, stone, or cast stone.

The proposed fence that will replace the existing contemporary fence shall abide by zoning code and be painted or stained.

New wood windows shall have a lite pattern that matches the original and new windows must be painted.

The new rooftop deck above the third floor shall not be in the direct pedestrian sight line from Calder Street and minimally visible from Bartrine Street.

Mr. Grumbine asked whether the second half of the sixth condition is being removed. Mr. Knee replied that it is.

Mr. Knee also said that the seventh condition will be that the new guardrails will be composed of glass or wire rope as presented in drawings.

Mrs. Gribble moved with revised and additional Conditions, Ms. Rucker seconded the motion. The motion was adopted with revised and additional Conditions a unanimous vote (7-0).

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

1. **Discussion on rewriting historic district guidelines.**

Mr. Grumbine handed out assignments for Board members to draft sections of the new historic district guidelines. Mr. Knee asked whether the Planning Bureau had set up a sharable file for the Board Members to use to share their work. Mr. Grumbine replied that he was not aware of such matters and asked if they’re referring to a Google Document. The Board members replied yes, that would be sufficient. Mr. Knee asked if the Planning Bureau could set that up as soon as possible. Mrs. Gribble stated that the document should be able to track changes and edits.

Mr. Grumbine noted that it is a big project and it won’t happen over night and that the assigned portions of the document are the majority of the text and that is where change happens. Mr. Knee said that the Planning Bureau will send a sharable file and before the next HARB meeting and changes will be on the file in order for others to review. Mr. Knee asked about work load and whether board members are able to submit changes. Mr. Chamberlin said he can probably do one section per month. Mr. Chamberlin said that everything should be submitted to the open document by the second to last Friday of the month so everyone has a week to review it. Mr. Knee said that at least a week is necessary. Mr. Chamberlin said to submit everything that has been completed up to that point. Mr. Grumbine agreed and said everything couldn’t possibly be done within a month as it will be a draft document for a while to come. Mr. Chamberlin said that Mr. Grumbine brought up a good point in that the document should never be done and the document will always be changing. Mrs. Gribble inferred that Mr. Chamberlin was referring to making amendments to the document. Mr. Chamberlin agreed and said that it would be done on a periodic basis at the end of HARB meetings. Mr. Chamberlin said that when the Board faces new issues or products, that they should act on it and add an amendment to the guidelines so that the guidelines will never have to be completely rewritten in the future. Mr. Knee added that he felt it was totally fine to lift text from the current guidelines to the new guidelines. Mr. Grumbine added that much of the verbiage from the current guidelines is from the 1995 Secretary of Interior Standards and that some of the standards may have changed whereas some have remained the same.

Mr. Knee said we can move forward as long as they can access the sharable document. Mr. Chamberlin inquired about the electronic version of the existing guidelines. Mr. Knee asked Mr. Grumbine if he could send the Board Members the document along with the sharable document.

Mr. Knee asked whether there were any other comments regarding the historic district guidelines. Mr. Chamberlin said windows is one of the categories, but it would be beneficial to work on that ahead of time. Mr. Grumbine said that one of the Applicants was going to propose polymer windows and that attempting to apply for that type of material would not be approved. Mr. Chamberlin asked what he meant by polymer windows and said that vinyl is a polymer. Mr. Grumbine agreed and said that vinyl is a polymer and the term is used by manufacturers to circumvent the practice of using the word vinyl.

Mr. Knee asked Mr. Morrison about whether Historic Harrisburg Association was able to reach out to others regarding the question of windows. Mr. Morrison said that he had gotten some answers back but nothing substantial. Mr. Grumbine said that one individual from Venice, Florida said that they install shatter-proof windows due to the fact they have severe weather patterns. Mr. Morrison said that it is interesting but does not help and that he will wait and see other responses regarding the question of windows. Mr. Grumbine said another individual that reached out to HHA stated that they use a longevity equation regarding windows and replacements but was unable to research the topic.

Mr. Knee noted to add to the agenda next month the issue of windows in other historic districts and asked the board members to do research for the next meeting. Mr. Morrison said that the life cycle equation for the windows was a link and Mr. Chamberlin asked if Mr. Grumbine could send it to them. Mr. Grumbine agreed and said he will email it to the Board Members.

Mr. Grumbine said that many historic district guidelines are available online for research. Mr. Chamberlin asked Mr. Grumbine about training for the Certified Local Government recognition and whether Board Members have to follow the Department of Interior Standards or if they can develop other guidelines. Mr. Grumbine said that there is training required for the Certified Local Government but is not entirely sure about the requirements of following Interior Standards. Mr. Chamberlin stated that if the Board were to follow the Secretary of Interior Standards as written, then we would be living in a museum not a city. Mr. Knee said bring as much as information as everyone can find for the next meeting and it can be edited accordingly. Mr. Grumbine said even each historic district in Harrisburg has it’s each contextual issues such as Shipoke will have different needs and materials than Midtown or Uptown.

**ADJOURNMENT: 8:03 PM**

Mr. Chamberlin moved, and Mrs. Montgomery seconded the motion, to adjourn. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (7-0) and the meeting adjourned at 8:03 PM.