MINUTES

**HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**April 1, 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, Deputy Codes Administrator

 April Rucker

 Jeremiah Chamberlin

 Neil Heffelfinger

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Camille Bennett

**STAFF PRESENT:**  Geoffrey Knight, Planning Director

 Tiffanie Baldock, Senior Deputy City Solicitor

**OTHERS PRESENT:** See attendance signature sheet

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

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The minutes from the March 4, 2019 meeting were approved with no corrections. Mrs. Gribble moved, and Mr. Chamberlin seconded the motion, to approve the minutes from the March 4th meeting. The Board approved the motion by unanimous vote (5-0); Mr. Knee abstained as he was not present at that meeting.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

1. **1022 Green Street, filed by Steven Toole, to revise the previously approved work proposal to remove the proposed case windows on the first, second, and third floors of the western elevation; infill the window openings with brick painted to match the surrounding brick; and to replace a proposed casement window near the rooftop deck with a new door.**

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

1. The Applicant will submit Special Exception and Variance applications for review and approval by the Harrisburg Planning Commission and the Zoning Hearing Board. The existing structure is a single-family dwelling, and the proposed subdivision of the property into two units requires a Special Exception, while the structure itself is smaller than that allowed to be converted to a “Multifamily Dwelling” per Section 7-309.2(v) of the Zoning Code, which requires that converted properties have a minimum of 2,500 square feet in area (the subject property is 2,232 square feet).
2. The Applicant will reuse one of the doors removed from the side façade for the access to the rooftop deck, so as to retain existing architectural elements in the structure.

The case was represented by Steven Toole (the property owner), 5005 Pellingham Circle, Enola, PA 17025 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mr. Knee asked the Applicant whether he had anything to add to the case report; the Applicant stated that he was happy to put new life into the building.

Mr. Knee asked whether any of the Board members had questions. Mr. Chamberlin inquired as to whether the Board had previously approved the rooftop deck; Mr. Knight confirmed that they had. Mr. Chamberlin asked where the proposed casement windows were to be located; Mr. Knight confirmed that they were proposed for the areas which were boarded up in the photos submitted by the Applicant.

Mr. Chamberlin asked whether the openings for the previously-approved casement windows had been bricked in; Mr. Knight confirmed that was the case for the first-floor window but that he wasn’t sure about the other floors.

Mr. Knee stated that he didn’t have any issues with the proposed project or the conditions in the case report. Mr. Chamberlin stated that he felt the type of mortar to be used was an important consideration in the project, noting that certain types of mortar were most appropriate for older brick.

Mr. Heffelfinger asked whether the Applicant intended on painting the proposed brick infill area; the Applicant stated that the entire building needed a new coat of paint, but that he would paint the new brick the same color as the existing façade. Mr. Heffelfinger noted that mortar wouldn’t end up showing through the paint, and Mrs. Gribble stated that the expansion and contraction of the mortar might affect the brick. The Applicant stated that he was planning on using the same mortar that other property owners in the surrounding neighborhood used to repair their façades. He asked whether there was a specific type of mortar the Board would like him to use; Mr. Chamberlin stated that he preferred that a lime-based mortar be used. Mr. Heffelfinger noted that the project on 2nd Street (specifically 1200 North 2nd Street) was using lime-based mortar; Mr. Chamberlin noted that in that case they were replacing all the bricks on the entire front façade.

The Applicant confirmed that all the brick being used in the project was recovered from on-site; Mr. Chamberlin stated that in that case, he would definitely want to use a lime-based mortar versus a Portland cement-based mortar. The Applicant stated that he understood, but wanted to use whatever mortar had previously been approved for his project at 1100 North 2nd Street.

Mr. Knee asked whether the Board should include a condition on the use of specific mortar in its resolution; Mr. Chamberlin stated that he would be happy to approve whatever the Board felt was appropriate.

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

Mr. Knee noted that they could add a condition that stipulated the use of previously approved materials. Mrs. Gribble stated that she wanted to see a condition added to the resolution regarding mortar type. The Applicant asked whether other projects that involved bricked-in windows had requirements on specific types of mortar; Mrs. Gribble stated that it shouldn’t impact the cost of the project and that the Board was most concerned about the longevity of the brick. The Applicant stated that while he understood the Board’s concerns, he was trying to move the project forward and was using masons that had done other work throughout the city; Mr. Chamberlin stated that most masons did not use the appropriate mortar materials.

The Applicant asked when the Board had last required a specific material in a masonry project and stated that he felt he was being singled out. The Board members stated that was not the case. The Applicant asked for language that included any mortar that had previously been approved by the Board and noted that he had water coming in through the building envelope and needed to move the project forward. Mr. Knee stated that the Board wanted to move the project forward, but they felt that specific language was necessary.

The Applicant reiterated his request to use “previously-approved” mortar to the resolution. Mr. Knight stated that if the Board wanted the Applicant to use “lime-based” mortar, they should include that language in the conditions of approval. The Board members discussed the condition amongst themselves.

Mr. Chamberlin noted that in a lime-mortar wall, the mortar would be the weak point, but that it could be easily repointed, and that this approach would allow the wall to last much longer than if Portland cement was used. Mrs. Gribble stated that she felt it was important to include the language. The Applicant asked whether the Board had recently reviewed any projects that included bricking-in windows. Mr. Chamberlin stated that he was not aware of any, but Mr. Knight noted that the issue did come up occasionally. The Applicant asked how those reviews were considered; Mr. Knight that he wasn’t sure, but that if the Board felt that a certain product would help the structure last longer, they should require its use.

The Applicant stated that he was in investor and that he didn’t want to be singled out for a particular mortar because other projects hadn’t had the same requirements placed on them. Mr. Knee stated that more explicit project requirements were something the Board had discussed during recent meetings and that they would be including more clarity in the updated Historic District Design Guidelines. The Applicant interrupted him and stated that it was a question of fairness and that the Board was applying rules to him that they did not apply to other developers.

Ms. Baldock interjected and asked the Board whether they had adopted any rules or regulations regarding the use of mortar. Mr. Chamberlin noted that that the Board had adopted rules and regulations regarding the “breathability” of brick and the coatings and materials applied to brick, including the many murals in the city’s historic districts. He noted that they had given fairly strict scrutiny to the reviews of Sprocket Mural Works’ proposals for painting brick. Mrs. Gribble concurred.

Mrs. Baldock stated that if they were going to apply this condition, they needed to be consistent and to do so going forward. Mr. Knee noted that the Board had recently reviewed a painted-brick project several months ago, and noted that they had been working on more explicit requirements in their resolutions, and stated that they were not singling out the Applicant. The Applicant stated that every additional requirement was another cost that had to be reviewed and stated that other developers had not been required to use specific materials. He stated that he wasn’t going to use mortar that didn’t work with the building, so that he was incentivized to do the best thing for the structure.

Mr. Chamberlin asked how many window openings were being reviewed; Mr. Knight noted that there were three openings that were being bricked in, and the Applicant stated that two were already bricked in. Mr. Chamberlin asked whether this was then an “after the fact” review, and Mr. Knight noted that the previously-approved casement windows hadn’t been installed and that the previous review had permitted the windows to be partially bricked-in.

Mr. Knee stated that he felt it made sense to apply a condition that the Applicant would use previously-approved materials or a limestone mortar product.

Ms. Baldock stated that the City, on behalf of the Board, wanted to be on record as takin exception to the notion or insinuation that the Board was acting unfairly towards this particular Applicant

Mr. Tom Duszak (1016 Green Street, Harrisburg, PA) thanked the Applicant for the investment in the property, and asked whether he was planning on replanting the tree in front of the house that had been lost during a storm two years ago. He also asked how many units the Applicant was proposing to establish in the building, and whether he was planning on painting the exterior of the building. The Applicant stated that he was going to refresh the paint on the exterior of the building where necessary, but that all the new brick would be painted the same color.

Mr. Knee asked whether there were any other public comments regarding the project; there were no comments.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that Mr. Heffelfinger had brought up that an applicant for a project on the 1600 block of North 3rd Street had used lime-based mortar when repointing his building.

Mrs. Gribble motioned, and Ms. Rucker seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff & Additional Conditions; the additional condition was that the Applicant would utilize a previously-approved or lime-based mortar. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (6-0).

1. **603 & 605 North 2nd Street, filed by Daniel Peltier, to install a six-foot-high, stockade-style wooden fence along the rear of the property and Liberty Street, as well as galvanized aluminum posts “framed in by like pickets.”**

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

1. The Applicant will not replace any length of the existing metal fence along Liberty Street so that an original historic element will be retained.
2. The Applicant will not utilize aluminum fence elements if they will be visible from a public right-of-way.
3. The wooden fence will be painted or stained upon installation.

The case was represented by Daniel & Casey Peltier (the owners), 1756 Marlin Ridge, Camp Hill, PA 17011 (aka “the Applicants”).

Mr. Knee asked the Applicants whether they had anything to add to the case report; the Applicants stated that the chain-link fence was not being replaced and that they would be constructing the wooden fence next to it on their property. Mr. Knee asked whether the existing chain-link fence was along the property line; Mr. Chamberlin stated that the exact location of the property line was a bit difficult to determine. The Applicants concurred and stated that they wanted to install the fence on their side to avoid the issue of where the property line was located.

Mr. Knee asked for a bit more clarification on the relation of the proposed fence to the existing fence. The Applicants stated that instead of putting in wooden posts that would eventually rot out, they would be installing aluminum posts and casing them in wood, so that they would only need to replace the fence panels whenever they rotted.

Mr. Knee clarified that his question was regarding the existing wrought-iron gate that provided access to the rear yard from Liberty Street; the Applicants confirmed it would remain. Mr. Knee stated that the first condition in the Planning Bureau’s case report did not appear to be applicable.

The Applicants stated that they ran a ministry on-site and that they housed ministry students.

Mr. Knee asked whether the Applicants would be painting or staining the fence, and they confirmed they would. A member of the public, who introduced herself as Pam McNett (208 Liberty Street, Harrisburg, PA), identified herself as the owner of the adjacent property along which the fence would be constructed; she asked whether the unfinished portion of the fence would face her property or the Applicants’. Mr. Knight clarified to the Applicants that she was referring to the outside of the proposed fence panels and asked whether those would be facing the neighbor’s property; the Applicants confirmed that was the case.

Ms. MacNett also noted that her sister, Colleen MacNett, owned the property at 610 Church Street and that both of their properties were adjacent to the subject property. She noted there was a tree toward the rear of the existing chain-link fence and asked whether they were going to build the wooden fence around the tree. Mr. Knee asked that anyone from the public address questions to the Board and not directly to the Applicants. The Applicants stated that they would do what was necessary to install the fence as proposed, but that they didn’t think it was necessary to remove the tree. Mr. Knee stated that any issues involved with the tree were outside of the Board’s purview. Ms. Colleen MacNett noted that the tree was growing up against the chain-link fence, so she was unsure of how that would affect the proposed installation location. Mr. Knight asked for clarification on the exact position of the tree, and Ms. MacNett confirmed it was on the Applicants’ side of the existing fence. Mr. Knight asked the Applicants whether they felt they could build the proposed fence along the existing fence without removing the tree; the Applicants stated that they didn’t care much about whether the tree remained and that their original intent was to frame around the tree so that it could remain.

Mr. Knight noted that retention of the tree was up to the Applicants since it was on their property. Ms. Baldock noted that that issue was not within HARB’s purview. The Applicants noted that the tree was located at a point where the fence turned, and thus the fence would need to turn at this point as well, so the tree could easily be accommodated.

Another member of the public, Kathy Speaker-MacNett (222 & 224 North Street), inquired about the Board’s position on stockade-style fences, noting that when she renovated her property at 222 North Street, the Board had not permitted stockade fencing. She asked whether the Board’s position on that style had changed. Mr. Knee stated that he couldn’t speak for the Board, but noted that they would be updating the Historic District Design Guidelines to provide more guidance. He stated that the Board wasn’t taking a firm position on a particular fence style, nor were they approving a previously-excluded product. Mr. Knight stated that in his six years with the City, the Planning Bureau had not differentiated between stockade or dog-eared fence styles and that the Board generally permitted either design. Mr. Knee noted that Mrs. Speaker-MacNett may have dealt with a situation where the specific context of the fence was relevant.

Mr. Heffelfinger asked whether the existing chain-link fence was on the property line; the Applicants confirmed that was the case. He asked whether the Applicants would be able to get access to paint, stain, or maintain both sides of the fence. The Applicants stated that they could easy remove the panels from their side of fence to do any necessary work.

Ms. MacNett asked whether there were any other examples of projects in the historic district in which a property owner had installed a wooden fence against a chain-link fence. Mr. Knee stated that he was not aware of any project like that. Mr. Knight noted that he wasn’t aware of any that were built against chain-link fences, but noted that there were a couple properties in which a wooden fence was installed behind decorative wrought-iron fences. Ms. MacNett noted that that would have a different aesthetic. Mr. Knight concurred but noted that a property owner was permitted to install a fence wherever they wanted on their property and that they did not have to remove an existing fence to do so.

Ms. MacNett stated that no one had been able to ascertain the exact property line and that the existing fence may not be on it; Mr. Knee noted that that was not an issue for the Board, which was only considering the appearance of the proposed fence. He stated that if that issue was in dispute, that the owners should employ a surveyor to identify the exact property line.

Mr. Knee again read through the Planning Bureau’s conditions of approval. Mr. Knee again asked if the conditions were acceptable and the Applicants confirmed they were. The Applicants asked for an explanation of how exactly the fence had to be constructed; Mr. Knight confirmed that the Zoning Code required the structural elements of the fence to be on the interior. The Applicants asked if they could install a “friendly neighbor” fence design in which the orientation of the fence panel was switched for every other panel. Mr. Knight noted that they could pursue a Variance for relief from that aspect of the Zoning Code, but stated that it likely wouldn’t be worth it to the Applicants. Mr. Chamberlin stated that he hadn’t heard that term before.

Mr. Knee asked whether there were any other comments from the Board members; there were no comments.

Mr. Heffelfinger motioned, and Ms. Montgomery seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (6-0).

1. **1829 North Front Street, filed by Jack Kay with Susquehanna Real Estate, to replace an existing window with a new egress and stairway on the northern elevation, and to install a new ADA ramp, steps, landing, doorway, and covered canopy on the southern elevation.**

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved with Conditions. The condition was that:

1. The Applicant will receive approval of the Floodplain Development Permit application which has been filed for the proposed ADA ramps and access stairs; additionally, the Applicant will continue working with the Planning Bureau towards a determination on whether the project constitutes a “substantial improvement” and thus requires floodproofing of the structure.
2. The Applicant will utilize a consistent railing design for all new access points (stairs and ramps) on the ground floor; the Planning Bureau would recommend that all railings utilize the black-powder-coated finish design proposed for the railings on the northern egress, and not the pipe rail design of the existing ADA ramps on-site.
3. The Planning Bureau is unsure of the design or materials of the proposed railings for the rooftop deck; it appears that the rooftop deck will utilize some combination of post-and-cable design and glazed glass. The Planning Bureau would recommend these designs and materials over other types, such as the ones proposed for the new ramps and stairs, to minimize their appearance from the ground and to better blend into the building’s architecture.
4. The Applicant will not utilize the proposed double-hung aluminum storefront window on the southern elevation, and will utilize a one-over-one, wooden design be utilized to match existing windows. Alternatively, the Planning Bureau would recommend a single-pane aluminum window would better differentiate the new addition from the existing historic windows and match the single-pane windows being installed in the new entrance on the southern elevation.
5. The Applicant will utilize the smooth limestone veneer tiles for the new façade treatment on the southern entrance.
6. The Applicant will utilize a brick or brick veneer façade for the new steps and landing on the northern elevation of the property.

The case was represented by Jack Kay & Phillip Briddell with Susquehanna Real Estate (the property owners), 140 East Market Street, York, PA 17401; and Rebecca McCormick w/ Murphy & Dittenhafer, Inc. (the project architect), 226 West Market Street, York, PA 17401 (aka “the Applicants”).

Mr. Knee asked the Applicants whether they had anything to add to the case report; the Applicants noted that the proposed use had been approved once before, although the units were planned for a new residential condominium building on-site which was not built due to the Recession in 2008. They noted that the existing building was proposed to be used as commercial office space, but that they determined that it would not work financially and thus they revised the plan to establish the proposed multifamily use. They noted that this would ensure the entire building could be put back into productive reuse.

Mr. Chamberlin asked if the interior was large enough to accommodate thirteen units and the Applicants confirmed that it was. He asked whether the proposal would meet the density regulations in the Zoning Code, and Mr. Knight noted that it had already received approval from the Zoning Hearing Board.

The Applicants noted that the single-pane window located next to the proposed entrance was actually part of the restaurant space, which was already replaced. Mr. Knight inquired as to which window they were discussing and they noted they were referring to the window to the left of the proposed entrance. Mr. Knight asked whether that statement was made in response to the first condition in the case report and they confirmed that was the case. Mr. Knight clarified that the case report was addressing the proposed window to be installed to the right of the proposed entrance. He noted that the proposal for that window was a one-over-one aluminum window, and that the Planning Bureau felt that a one-over-one wooden window, to match the surrounding windows, was more appropriate or, alternatively, a single-pane aluminum window to match the updates to the new entrance.

The Applicants noted that their contractors though the frameless glass door proposed for the new entry would be problematic, due to the installation of an electronic access system required for security, and that they were proposing a storefront glass door with an aluminum frame, although they would use a model with as much glass as possible. Mr. Chamberlin stated that he expected there to be a button for ADA access since the ramp was being installed; the Applicants stated that they were not proposing an ADA-accessible unit for the property. Mr. Chamberlin asked whether an ADA unit was required in the building; Mr. Knight stated that such an issue would not be within HARB’s purview.

Mrs. Gribble asked the architect to discuss the various elements of the proposal for the Board members’ benefit. Ms. McCormick noted the various elevations of the building. She noted that the new egress stairway on the northern façade would create access through an existing window, so there would be minimal change to the appearance. She noted the southern elevation would feature a new stairway, an ADA connection to the existing ADA ramp, a new awning over the entrance, and new aluminum windows. She noted that all of the boarded-up and deteriorated windows were not original and would be replaced with aluminum-clad windows. She noted that the windows in Char’s restaurant (a separate condominiumized space) had already been replaced and that the project would use similar black, aluminum-clad windows with wood interiors. Ms. McCormick noted that the masonry work around the window opening that would be the secondary egress would remain intact, and that a transom would be installed. She also noted that they were enlarging an existing window opening on the southern façade to accommodate a larger, single-pane glass window; Mr. Knight clarified that this window was being proposed for the eastern façade of the entrance area.

Mr. Knee asked about the proposed window in the stairwell area on the southern elevation. The Applicants noted that they would be replacing that window with a custom-framed window since the dimension of that opening was different from the surrounding sections. Ms. McCormick noted that this was a newer section of the building. Mr. Knight stated that that was the window referenced in the conditions, but noted that he wasn’t aware the existing windows were aluminum.

Mr. Chamberlin asked whether the Applicants were planning on replacing the boarded-up windows with aluminum-clad windows; the Applicants confirmed that was the case. The Applicants noted that the original buildings on-site, the main house and the carriage house, were constructed in 1924. They noted that an addition was added in 1955, and that all the structures were connected via another addition sometime after 1965. The Applicants reiterated that they were proposing to replace existing windows with aluminum-clad wood windows. Mr. Chamberlin asked whether they would be using a six-over-six pane configuration; the Applicants noted that there were a variety of pane configurations throughout the building.

Mr. Knee noted that aside from materiality issues, none of the proposed windows were changing much from the existing conditions. Mr. Knight noted that there was a new window being proposed for the eastern elevation of the main entrance area, and that the former window installed there had been bricked-in. Ms. McCormick noted that the required secondary egress on the northern elevation would require cutting out the window sill in order to install a new door.

Mr. Knee asked whether any Board members had other comments on the proposal up to that point. Mr. Chamberlin noted that had he been on the Board when the windows were replaced at Char’s restaurant, he would have insisted on a different material; Mr. Knight noted that that project had not been done while he was with the City. Mr. Chamberlin noted that the existing aluminum windows provided a precedent for approving the proposed aluminum windows.

Mr. Knee noted that the Board should finalize its review of the window elements of the project, before moving to a review of the ramp and the railings. He read the fourth condition of approval from the case report; Mr. Chamberlin stated that the language should be struck and replaced with a condition that proposed windows materially- and stylistically-match the existing replacement windows on the western portion of the building. Mr. Knight noted that he was recommending replacement windows be a one-over-one pane configuration to match the surrounding windows; Mr. Chamberlin noted that if they were allowing them to match existing aluminum windows in the front half of the building, they should use a similar style, including division into multiple panes.

Mr. Knee noted that the property was comprised of four individual structures or additions, and asked whether the Board should be recommending an overall approach that sought to unify these different elements or keep them as distinct elements. The Applicants noted the front entry would intentionally be a separate and unique element that would differ from the rest of the building. The Applicants noted that there were some common elements in material and style that could guide the installation of some new elements, but they also wanted the new entry to stand out as a different aspect of the property from the existing restaurant. They stated that each building had unique elements that contributed to the overall aesthetic of the building.

Mr. Knight read back the revised language for the fourth condition as proposed by Mr. Chamberlin and noted that the western portion of the property did include one-over-one windows. Mr. Knee asked whether all the windows on the western half had been replaced; the Applicants confirmed that only the first-floor windows had been replaced. Mr. Knee asked whether the proposed apartment units would occupy the entire second and third floors, and the Applicants confirmed that was the case. The Applicants noted that the fenestration on the northern façade, where more modern windows had matched historic windows, was different from the fenestration on the southern façade, which had less attention to detail.

Mr. Knee next addressed the issues of the ADA ramp and the railings proposed for the first floor of the building. He referenced the third condition of approval from the Planning Bureau’s case report and asked whether the Applicants were able to make that change. The Applicants noted that they were proposing the black powder-coated aluminum railing on the northern elevation of the building and the top of the proposed ADA ramp on the southern elevation; they noted that they didn’t include that aspect all the way to the connection to the existing ADA ramp. Mr. Knight stated that the recommendation was to utilize the black powder-coated design throughout the entry areas, so that it did not create visual inconsistencies between different elements. The Board members expressed agreement.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that if he were installing the ramp on his property, he would maintain the pipe railing up until the black powder-coated railing portion. Mrs. Gribble concurred that having only two railing designs would be preferable to having three separate designs. The Applicants noted that they had considered different variations for the railings, and stated that they didn’t maintain the pipe railing design because the ramp was going to have a brick veneer and thus was differentiated from the existing ramp. The Applicants noted that they weren’t required to have a guardrail at this location because it was actually a “sloped walk” and not a “ramp.”

Mr. Knee noted that there were vertical elements on the building behind the proposed ramp and that the existing pipe design and the powder-coated aluminum design should try to meet at one of those points to differentiate new elements from the existing structure. The Applicants stated that they had initially proposed glass railings instead of pickets, but that they felt the current proposal was the best for the site.

Mr. Knee noted that the existing ramp ended before the more-modern building addition for which the new entrance was being proposed; the Applicants noted that they were extending the landing for the existing ADA ramp, and then adding a sloped walkway up to the proposed entrance. They noted that they were proposing to extend the concrete design to the new ramp landing area, and then adding brick façade to the sloped portion of the new construction. Mr. Knee stated that he felt the ramp design should be the same the whole way through the new addition, regardless of what materials or style were approved, to allow the visual break in the aesthetics to happen at the new entrance. He approached the Applicants’ presentation boards and explained his approach to the project; Mr. Chamberlin noted that his approach would have the pipe railing design run all the way to the landing for the new entrance, and Mr. Knee confirmed that was the case. The Applicants stated that they were trying to match the existing aesthetic of the railing for the ADA ramp to Char’s restaurant.

Mr. Knee also inquired about the space between the proposed sloped walkway and the building, noting that there was an existing vent structure that would remain. Mr. Knight noted that stairs to the basement would be incorporated into the proposed design, and the Applicants noted that it was required to provide access to the mechanical area in the basement. They also noted that they would be planting screening in front of the sloped walkway which would minimize its appearance.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that the proposal as discussed by the Board appeared to create an attractive compromise.

Mr. Knee referenced the second condition in the case report and noted that the Board members sounded as though they wanted to strike it from the final resolution. Mr. Knight requested clarification on whether the Board wanted the pipe railing design from the existing ADA ramp to extend up to the picketed railing design near the new entrance. Mr. Knee confirmed that was the case, and asked whether that included the brick veneer finish as well.

The Applicants noted that they were also proposing a post-and-cable railing design on the rooftop deck, and Mr. Chamberlin noted that they would addressing that shortly.

Mr. Chamberlin asked about the limestone veneer proposed for the new entrance to the apartments. Mr. Knee stated that he didn’t have any problems with the proposal since he felt the entrance needed to be highlighted; Mr. Chamberlin stated he felt it was an improvement and that it clearly identified the entrance as a modern façade treatment for a new use in the building. He asked if they were keeping the copper flashing above the proposed entrance; the Applicants confirmed that they were. The Applicants confirmed the veneer was comprised of thin tiles that would be in line with the flashing and that it would extend all the way down to the sloped walkway.

The Board members discussed the relationship of the proposed façade treatments for the ADA ramp/sloped walkway, the new entrance area, and the secondary egress on the northern elevation. Mr. Knight stated that he felt the ADA ramp/sloped walkway should have the same façade treatment as the secondary egress and that he felt that whatever treatment the Board members selected should be applied to both areas.

Mr. Chamberlin asked whether the frame for the proposed secondary egress was to be aluminum; the Applicants responded that it would be a wooden door. They stated that the landing for the secondary egress on the northern elevation was new and that a paver path would connect to an existing entrance on the northern elevation.

Mr. David Morrison (representing the Historic Harrisburg Association) spoke and noted that the northern and southern façades of the first building addition were different because the northern elevation was the main entrance and the southern elevation faced the rear yards of properties along North 2nd Street and Front Street that had been demolished in past. He noted that it was now more visible and prominent since the adjacent structures had been demolished after flooding during Hurricane Agnes in 1972.

Mr. Knee stated that he didn’t feel as though the northern and southern façades needed to match; Mr. Chamberlin concurred, noting that if they were visible at the same time, it would be more important for them to match.

The Board members came back to the proposed limestone façade treatment for the new entrance. Mr. Knight noted that he had included a condition to use the smooth-faced limestone tiles from the product specifications, so that it matched the existing limestone architectural elements on the rest of the building. The Applicants confirmed they were planning on utilizing the smooth limestone tiles.

Mr. Knight asked for clarification on whether the Board was requiring the Applicant to maintain the proposed brick veneer on the sloped walkway. Mr. Knee confirmed that that was the case. The Applicants confirmed they were proposing to use a skim coat of concrete over the CMU blocks for the secondary egress on the northern façade. Mr. Knight stated that he was concerned the concrete veneer would stand out as unattractive features, noting the appearance of the nearby ADA ramp towards the rear of the building. He stated that he felt the new access should blend into the existing façade better and not given the building a disjointed aesthetic. Mr. Chamberlin noted that the existing rear access appeared to have been cut into a window opening.

Mr. Knee asked whether those sections and the kitchen utility equipment visible on the northern elevation was going to stay; the Applicants noted that it belonged to the restaurant on the first floor and that it would remain. Mr. Knee stated that he didn’t want to create too many different visual elements on the northern façade and that if existing elements such as the ADA ramp and mechanical equipment were changed in the future, they could be required to conform to the design aesthetic required by the Board for the current project. Mr. Chamberlin stated that the Applicants could use more plant screening on-site to cover some of the new construction. Mrs. Gribble stated that she felt either brick veneer or concrete could be acceptable for either access point on either façade.

Mr. Knee stated that he felt the sixth condition in the case report could be stricken, with a notation added that the Board would defer to the designs of the project architect. The Board members concurred.

Mr. Knee noted that the final issue to be discussed was the rooftop deck and proposed design elements. Mr. Chamberlin asked whether the railing would be visible from the ground; the Applicants stated that they designed it to be minimally-visible from the street. Mrs. Gribble noted that these elements would be most visible from the parking lot to the south, and Mr. Knight noted there were two separate aspects of the rooftop deck; the Applicants noted that the smaller space was only accessible from one of the dwelling units.

The Applicants stated that the fence would be installed behind the parapet wall on the roof, so that the elements would be minimally-visible. Mr. Knight noted that they would also be replacing a wooden structure on the roof with a glass-enclosed vestibule. The Applicants reiterated that they would be using a post-and-cable design with a steel top rail. Mr. Knee referenced the third condition of the case report, noting that the Planning Bureau had recommended not using the same railing design as for the ramps and stairs. The Applicants confirmed that would be the case.

Mr. Knee asked whether there were any other issues to discuss; Mr. Knight noted that the Board had not discussed the proposed aluminum canopies on site. Mr. Chamberlin noted that the Board had reviewed a similar proposal at one point recently; Mr. Knight stated that he couldn’t recall that specific case that Mr. Chamberlin was referencing. Mr. Chamberlin referenced the awning above the proposed main entrance, noting that the awning complemented the proposed modern materials for that area.

Mr. Knight confirmed the Applicants had also proposed a canopy on the rooftop deck. Mrs. Gribble inquired as to the manufacturer, but the Applicants were unsure. They noted that they felt they needed a canopy on the rooftop for protection from the elements, but that they weren’t entirely sure how it would look. They noted that they may remove it from the final proposal. Mr. Knight recommended the Board include a condition in the final resolution that if the Applicants did install a rooftop canopy, it match the one proposed for the main entrance. Mr. Knee concurred with this proposal.

Mr. Knight confirmed that the final resolution included the first, third, and fifth conditions from the Planning Bureau’s case report; that the second, fourth, and sixth conditions would be modified; and that a seventh condition would be added.

Mr. Chamberlin motioned, and Ms. Rucker seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff & Additional Conditions; the additional conditions were that:

1. Condition #2 in the case report would be modified to stated that the railing of the sloped walkway along the southern entrance would utilize the same railing design as the existing ADA ramp;
2. Condition #4 in the case report would be stricken and should read that the proposed windows will “materially and stylistically match the Char’s side of the building;”
3. Condition #6 in the case report would be stricken and should read that the Board “defers to the architect’s design;” and
4. Condition #7 will be added and should read that if the Applicants do install a canopy over the rooftop deck, it should be of the same material and design as the approved canopy over the main (southern) entrance to the apartments.

The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (6-0).

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

1. **Discussion on historic district regulations and revisions to existing HARB Historic District Design Guidelines**

Mr. Knee noted that he had developed the draft Table of Contents for the updated version of the HARB Historic District Design Guidelines, and that it was based roughly on the format for the existing Guidelines.

Mr. Knight introduced Ms. Elizabeth Rairigh with the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission and David Morrison with the Historic Harrisburg Association. He stated that they would be able to provide guidance on the development of the document itself, the inclusion of various topics and how to approach the community regarding the update, as well as what responsibilities and legal authority the Board had.

Mr. Knight noted that he had previously discussed historic preservation issues with Brian Van Sweden, PHMC’s Community Preservation Coordinator, regarding issues like local review of Individually-Listed Properties on the National Register of Historic Places, which was not legally permitted. Mr. Chamberlin asked whether the City could create a regulatory structure that allowed them to do that; Mr. Knight noted that they could not because it was not authorized in the State’s enabling legislation. Ms. Rairigh noted that some states were permitted to create single-property historic districts.

Mr. Knee noted that some historic architectural elements only appeared on one building within an historic district and that they could still be included in the Guidelines. Mr. Knight noted there were a number of historically- and architecturally-significant buildings were not located in designated historic districts; he noted that while the Board and the community may want to preserve these structures, there was no regulatory structure for them to review such resources.

Mr. Chamberlin asked whether certain restrictions, such as requiring HARB approval for projects, could be placed on Land Development Plans; Mr. Knight noted that such conditions would not be applicable to areas in which HARB did not have purview. He noted that City Council could place conditions that perhaps encouraged coordination with the Board on certain issues, but could not require such reviews. Mr. Knight noted that City Council may be less likely than the Planning Commission to hold developers to such conditions.

Mr. Knight recommended that Board members address inquiries to Ms. Rairigh and Mr. Morrison regarding Guideline issues such as topics, format, or HARB purview and legal authority.

Mr. Knee summarized the reason for updating the Guidelines, noting that while the current document was adequate, it wasn’t meeting all the needs of the public. He stated that he expected it to be more of a referential or explanatory document. He noted that the proposed document was broken into several sections, including: 1) history of historic district legislation; 2) description of the HARB review process; 3) familiarizing the public with common architectural features and elements; and 4) specific regulations and policies, for citywide and individual districts. He stated that it was his intent to develop a document that could provide recommendations on projects even if they were not within HARB’s official purview.

Mr. Knight asked Ms. Rairigh about her thoughts on the topics as listed by Mr. Knee; she noted that the list was extensive but was not too much. She stated that clarity was important and determining whether the document was for developers or the public might determine how information was structured. Ms. Rairigh congratulated the Board on updating the document, noting that many boards were as proactive, and stated that PHMC was also updating their guidelines for Certified Local Governments (CLG). She noted that one of the updates was requiring boards to have illustrated design guidelines and that the City was in compliance with that aspect. Ms. Rairigh noted that PHMC would be starting work on the updating regulations in June 2019 and developing them through 2020. Mr. Chamberlin stated that the Board could design the document so that it could continually be updated with new illustrations.

Mr. Knight noted that the City would be hiring an Historic Preservation Specialist /Archivist fairly shortly, and that that person would be able to focus on the development of the documentation and surveying the historic districts for photos. Ms. Rairigh concurred that it would be best if the document included photos of historic and architectural features from properties within the community, if possible.

Mr. Knee noted that the Board was planning on developing overarching guidelines as the foundation for properties in historic districts throughout the city, as well as more tailored ones for each district. Ms. Rairigh concurred that was a good approach as the individual features of distinct districts are what made them unique and important.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that there was a difference in how the specificity of various elements was reviewed; noting that windows were often subject to conditions on pane configuration, profile, material, and sash arrangement, whereas aspects of porches such as turned spindles versus 2” x 2” posts may be overlooked.

Mr. Knight asked Ms. Rairigh whether she recommended the Board broadly solicit advice and input from the community in developing the Guidelines, or tailor the discussion to focus on more narrow aspects of the document. She strongly recommended public comment and that feedback be solicited before the information in the document was fully developed. Mrs. Gribble noted that the Board already had a fully-developed document and that she felt the approach should ask the community how they would “evolve” the existing Guidelines. Ms. Rairigh suggested they identify issues such as windows or roofs that were commonly included in COA applications, and solicit input from the community on how those should be regulated going forward. Mrs. Gribble stated that they should include topics they weren’t often reviewed, but that Board members wished were, such as sidewalks.

Mr. Knee stated that it sounded as though the process would be time- and labor-intensive, and that he wasn’t sure the Board members and Planning Bureau had the capacity to manage that much work; Mr. Knight noted that as soon as the new staff was hired, they would be focused on this initiative and that he would have more time to dedicate as well.

Ms. Rairigh noted that PHMC would be happy to assist the City as a Certified Local Government. She noted that PHMC was working with the County on a survey of historic resources in areas that are prone to flooding and other natural disasters. Mr. Chamberlin inquired as to the goal of the surveys; she noted they were trying to identify any unknown historic resources, update information on others, evaluate districts, and redefine boundaries. She noted that it came from funding for Hurricane Sandy mitigation as well as CLG grants.

Mr. Knight asked whether Ms. Rairigh knew of communities that had administrative approval processes for projects that involved changes to existing conditions, but that were improvements to the overall historic character and context of a property. He noted that the Planning Bureau would sometimes approve such projects as a way of incentivizing property owners to undertake appropriate projects; he noted that the goal was not to supersede the authority of the Board, but to encourage good projects. Ms. Rairigh stated that she would have to research whether that was prevalent in the state’s CLG communities. Mr. Chamberlin noted that the Board had granted the Planning Bureau the authority to administratively approve certain materials.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that by-right replacement of historically-inappropriate materials such as vinyl siding or chain link fences did not convey in perpetuity; Mr. Knight corrected him and noted that it does convey as such. Mr. Knight noted that he wasn’t sure about PHMC’s perspective on having municipal staff adopt aspects of review authority granted to the Board. Mr. Chamberlin noted that the City could waive fees for good projects, and Mr. Knight noted that any proposal that reduced the City’s revenue was likely a non-starter. Ms. Rairigh suggested a façade improvement program to incentivize appropriate projects since the City would control the investment.

Mr. Knight asked whether there were any municipalities that operated their own construction materials store in which architectural features from demolitions or substantial projects could be stored until they could be resold at cost to an owner of property in a municipal historic district, to ensure that the work was done in an historically-contextual manner. Ms. Rairigh confirmed that she had worked with a community in New Jersey that successfully ran a similar program, but that it had been easier because all the homes had been constructed by the same architect. Mr. Knight noted that HHA did hold materials such as bricks that were removed during the construction of large projects like the State Archives or Federal Courthouse. Ms. Rairigh noted that another community had done a tool-rental program.

Mr. Knee asked for guidance on recordkeeping for past projects so that the Board could understand how previous members had made decisions and know what decisions may have been precedent-setting. Mr. Chamberlin noted that the Board had granted administrative approval authority for some alternative materials; Ms. Rairigh stated that a “living document” would be a good idea, noting that she had seen a similar document during her time in Massachusetts. Mr. Knee asked whether the current Board could “de-authorize” precedents set under previous Boards, such as for materials that the current Board did not want to continue approving. Ms. Baldock noted that if something had substantively changed, then that might provide a justification for changing views on specific projects or materials. Mr. Knee noted that such projects wouldn’t necessarily come before the Board because they would be granted administrative approval by the Planning Bureau. Ms. Baldock confirmed that they could as long as they had a standard or reason that justified the action.

Mr. Knee noted that he wanted to make sure the document would be useful and applicable even under different administrations that might not prioritize historic preservation as much as the current one.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that it sounded as though the Board wanted to apply more stringent standards than they currently did; Mr. Knight noted that the discussion was more geared towards promoting compliance with historic district regulations. Mr. Chamberlin reiterated his previous example of 2”x2” wooden spindles versus turned spindles; he noted that while the material may be appropriate, the design was not, although often times these types of projects were approved. Mr. Knight asked whether the adoption of a new document could establish a new “regime” for review of historic district projects, which could terminate any precedents for projects in historic districts. Mr. Chamberlin noted that he wasn’t promoting that angle, just asking whether the Board was permitted to act in that manner. Mr. Knee noted that he felt the Board would address that issues through the public input process.

Mr. Knee asked whether there were resources to help with the public engagement and printing aspects of the process. Mr. Knight noted that the Planning Bureau did have money in its budget for printing and other requests, but that a significant portion was being dedicated to the Comprehensive Plan process. Ms. Rairigh noted that PHMC was considering opening up a round of “mini grants” that would be dedicated to small funding requests for projects like façade programs and document development. Mr. Chamberlin asked how that money would be disbursed and Mr. Knight noted that it was advisable to have any funding routed through a third party, such as HHA. Mr. Morrison noted that a variety of organizations, including HHA, could be the funded entity to host public engagement meetings. He also noted that his organization had access to a significant list of individuals interested in historic preservation in the city, which would be useful in disseminating or soliciting information or notifying the public about the process.

Mr. Morrison agreed with Ms. Rairigh that the document should maintain and increase the number of recognizable photos of properties from the existing document. Mr. Knight asked whether HHA had the digital files for the current document so that they could include those photos in the updated document. Mr. Morrison stated that he would ask Jeb Stuart, who once worked for the City.

Mr. Morrison reiterated that HHA could be a great asset in the public engagement portion, noting that they had recently had an event that was well-attended by the community and involved good, dynamic conversation. He noted that HHA’s building was located within walking distance of most of the city’s historic districts and they had a significant amount of free parking nearby (at the Broad Street Market). Mr. Morrison noted that he had a list of minor adjustments to the current document that he would share with Planning Bureau staff. He suggested that substantive changes, such as right-of-way purview and alternative materials, would be the most difficult issues to tackle. Mr. Knight noted that the Board had restrictions on the topics within its purview.

Mr. Knight asked Ms. Rairigh if she had any additional thoughts on the document development process or the public engagement process. She stated that the biggest aspect was staying engaged with residents and property owners. She also stated that PHMC would be a resource for the Board in whatever capacity they needed.

Mr. Knee asked whether there were any other issues to discuss. Mrs. Gribble asked Mr. Knee if he needed any help in developing the document outline; he noted that he was currently pulling information from the existing document, developing a draft outline, and determining how to distribute chapters for Board members to begin researching. Mr. Chamberlin suggested they use a Google documents format. Mrs. Gribble suggested assigning individual sections to different Board members and reserving time for discussion in future meetings. Mrs. Baldock suggested Mr. Knight establish the Google document to distribute to Board members.

**ADJOURNMENT: 8:30 PM**

Mr. Chamberlin motioned, and Mrs. Gribble seconded the motion, to adjourn. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (6-0) and the meeting adjourned at 8:30 PM.