

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 6, 2020**

MINUTES

**HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
January 6, 2020
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
Neil Heffelfinger
Jeremiah Chamberlin
Camille Bennett, Arrived at 6:07PM
April Rucker, Arrived at 6:02PM

MEMBERS ABSENT: N/A

STAFF PRESENT: Frank Grumbine, Historic Preservation Specialist and Archivist
Isaac Gaylord, City Solicitor

OTHERS PRESENT: See attendance signature sheet

CALL TO ORDER: 6:01 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mrs. Montgomery moved, and Mr. Chamberlin seconded the motion, to Approve the November 4th minutes. The Board approved the motion to Approve minutes from the November meeting by unanimous vote (5-0).

OLD BUSINESS: N/A

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1 121 Herr Street, filed by Carol Freeman, to replace existing wooden windows with double hung Marvin Integrity fiberglass and acrylic windows.**

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

1. The proposed replacement windows feature materials (fiberglass and acrylic resins) that are not an historically contextual or compatible material, and do not feature *any* wooden material

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 6, 2020**

on the exterior of the window, as opposed to other products that HARB has reviewed and approved in the past (such as wood composite). HARB has consistently denied the use of such material in replacing historic elements such as windows.

2. The original wooden windows are the few remaining architectural elements that gives this structure historic integrity. Efforts to repair and rehabilitation of original wood windows should be performed before replacing them with other materials.
3. 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.

The case was represented by Carol Freeman, 3601 Harford Road Baltimore, MD 21218 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mr. Knee asked the Applicant whether she had anything to add. The Applicant said she is an architect and has used similar windows in historic zonings and the windows give the building higher energy efficiency. The Applicant stated that the existing windows are not able to be rehabilitated and are falling apart and that the property is in very poor condition and she is eager to improve the property and the community. The Applicant stated that there has been interest from the board to allow different materials for windows and is why she decided to pursue this type of material.

Mr. Grumbine stated that the windows are paintable from the manufacturer and that this product has been installed in various other historic districts. Mr. Knee stated that the board has been talking about alternative materials and stated that a lot of the metrics that they have been discussing appear to be met with this product.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that HARB has approved fiberglass doors, therefore it is not too radical to consider fiberglass as a window material. Mr. Chamberlin also stated that the corners of the window are different from wood windows and that it comes down to how the product is installed in the structure’s existing openings.

The Applicant stated that she plans on removing windows and frames within the structure and will be a complete reconstruction and that she is planning on replicating the existing windows and their appearance.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that maintaining the existing dimensions of the historic brick molding and window size is of interest to HARB. Mrs. Gribble said that there likely would not be a big difference to replace one-over-one because the Applicant does not need to replicate any additional window details including muntin bars. Mrs. Gribble continued to state that the impacts of their replacement would not be as great as other more detailed windows.

Mr. Knee stated that one of his primary concerns is the durability of the material. Mr. Chamberlin stated that fiberglass should last very long, especially if it is painted. Mr. Heffelfinger stated that he is ready to approve it since it appears to meet all of their requirements.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 6, 2020**

Mr. Chamberlin inquired about whether or not the Board should require the windows to be painted.

Mrs. Rucker asked whether there is a certificate from the manufacturer stating that the product is paintable. Mr. Grumbine stated that he has researched the product and the manufacturer has published instructions for painting the product on a specifications sheet. The Applicant stated that the product comes in 6 different prefinished colors. Mr. Grumbine said that he read that the manufacturer recommends that the exterior finish be prepared with TSP and painted with a high-quality latex paint.

Mrs. Gribble stated that the corners of the windows would typically have a butt joint from the bottom rail to the side pieces, which is typical of wood windows. Mrs. Gribble stated that the exposure of one-over-one is limited and that fiberglass expands and contracts with thermal changes and therefore it should have longevity. The Applicant stated that the inside of the window is composed of wood.

Mr. Grumbine stated that he had trouble with this product because HARB has previously approved of fiberglass doors and agrees that windows and doors are similar in that they are both architectural openings.

Mr. Knee asked if there were any public comments regarding the case. There were no comments.

Mr. Chamberlin said that he does not know how the windows will be fitted in the openings and that if HARB is leaning towards approving it, he would like to see a condition to state that the windows would retain the same dimensions and fitment of original windows. The Applicant stated that would be her intention. Mr. Knee asked the Applicant whether she could meet this condition. The Applicant answered that she would meet it.

Mrs. Gribble referred to an illustration in the application and that the windows were projecting from the structure and wanted to make sure that the Applicant was not intending install the windows in this manner. The Applicant stated that she is planning to replicating the original window placement within the openings as close as possible.

Mr. Grumbine asked Mr. Knee to repeat the proposed condition for approval. Mr. Knee stated that the new windows shall replicate the original windows at every extent possible including fenestration placement, exposure, and depth within original openings.

Mr. Chamberlin moved, Mrs. Rucker seconded the motion to Approve with an additional condition. The motion was adopted with a unanimous vote (7-0).

- 2 250 Reily Street, filed by Richard Gribble, to remove and redesign existing façade. Work includes removing existing mansard roof and use materials such as fiber cement board, aluminum reveal, aluminum storefront glass, and masonry cement.**

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 6, 2020**

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

1. The Applicant with work with the Planning Bureau if project requires the relocation of existing bike racks.
2. The existing “Reily Midtown Center” sign shall be preserved and reused.
3. If the proposed trellis is constructed it shall be painted.

The case was represented by Richard Gribble, 203 Harris Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mr. Knee stated that there is a potential conflict of interest of one of the members of the Board. Mrs. Gribble abstained from taking part in both the discussion and vote for the case.

Mr. Knee asked the Applicant whether they had anything to add to the proposal. The Applicant stated that they would have no problem meeting the conditions from the Planning Bureau and that they would preserve and reuse the existing sign on the interior.

Mr. Knee stated that usually the condition states that materials are reused or donated to other organizations, and that the condition may have to be modified to include donation of the sign if the owners don’t use it in the future. Mr. Knee stated that he feels that the storefront does have some historic integrity.

Mrs. Bennett asked the Applicant if there is going to be lighting. The Applicant stated that there will be lighting at the front entrance and along the front but have not finalized the lighting portion of the design.

Mr. Knee asked whether or not the storefront windows have historic integrity or not. The Applicant referred to the original historic storefront photo dating from 1940 and stated that the existing windows are not the original windows and are also in poor condition. The Applicant stated that the glass could not be salvaged because their removal will cause damage. Mr. Grumbine stated that the windows that are installed now are certainly not from 1940.

Mr. Knee stated that the façade of the building already does not fit into the current vernacular of the neighborhood and struggles to approve of the proposed design because of this issue. The Applicant stated that the Susquehanna Art Museum is similar to the design principles that would be used in this redesign of the storefront. The Applicant stated that the updated design of the theater would allow for reinvestment into the neighborhood. The Applicant also stated that the façade does not represent a façade of a cinema. Mr. Knee stated that he is concerned about scale and massing of the design within the context of the neighborhood. Mr. Chamberlin stated that he likes the design.

Mr. Grumbine stated that the design being proposed will likely be considered a historic architectural style in the future, and the hope is that it will be planned for preservation.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 6, 2020**

Mr. Knee read the conditions from the Planning Bureau and stated that second condition should be modified to say “the existing Reily Midtown Center sign shall be preserved and reused and donated for reuse if not used by building owners.”

Mr. Knee read the third condition and asked the Applicant whether the trellis would be constructed. The Applicant stated that it depends on the cost of the project and that it is likely that it will be a wood trellis compared to the cost for a steel trellis. The Applicant stated that if it is wood, then it will be painted.

Mr. Knee opened up the discussion for public comment. There were no comments.

Mrs. Bennett moved to Approve with conditions as modified, Mrs. Montgomery seconded the motion to Approve. The motion was adopted with a unanimous vote (6-0) with Mrs. Gribble abstaining.

3 1401 North 3rd Street, filed by Richard Gribble, to install a new exterior door to the side courtyard.

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

1. The proposed materials and products are contemporaneous and compatible with existing materials used in the structure.
2. The proposed project will not alter or affect any historic materials, craftsmanship, or association within the historic district.
3. The addition of a side exterior door will allow for additional educational opportunities and means of egress.

The case was represented by Richard Gribble, 203 Harris Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mrs. Gribble abstained from participating in any discussion or vote from the case.

Mr. Knee asked the Applicant whether they had anything to add to the proposal. The Applicant had nothing to add.

Mrs. Rucker moved to Approve, Mrs. Bennett seconded the motion to Approve. The motion was adopted with a unanimous vote (6-0) with Mrs. Gribble abstaining.

OTHER BUSINESS:

1 Discussion on historic district guidelines.

Mr. Knee asked whether members had their revised sections of the draft version of the new historic district design guidelines. Mrs. Gribble stated that she had sent her revisions to Mr. Grumbine. Mr. Knee asked Mr. Grumbine if he is taking responsibility of compiling the new revisions into a new document. Mr. Grumbine stated that he has assumed that responsibility.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 6, 2020**

Mr. Chamberlin stated that he had brought hard copies of what he has revised thus far. Mr. Grumbine stated that he has developed a rough table of contents for the new design guidelines.

Mr. Knee said that they should set dates to read through each member's assigned sections. Mr. Chamberlin inquired about the formatting of the new document and how the information should be presented in the new document. Mrs. Gribble stated that she feels that they should get all the information together and then decide on a formatting style.

Mr. Knee agreed and said that all the information and text should be compiled and then work on the formatting of the document. Mrs. Gribble said that at the public meeting in October, the members had received some public input and should use that information when developing the document. Mr. Grumbine stated that he has been in contact with individuals from the public regarding issues and topics with the new design guidelines.

Mrs. Gribble said that one person needs to manage the reworking of the new document. Mr. Grumbine stated that he has been doing this and has a very rough draft of a new design guideline. Mr. Grumbine also stated that a big portion of the work for the document would be the formatting of the design of the document. Mr. Knee asked for members to add a list and heading for each section including recommended practices, not recommended practices, what procedures are administratively approved and not administratively approved.

Mr. Grumbine asked the Board about the formatting of the rehabilitation section of the new guidelines and stated that there are two general ways to format the document; the first is to list rehabilitation methods for materials and the second is to list rehabilitation methods for architectural elements. Mr. Chamberlin stated that it should be developed in a way that is most useful to those who will be using the document.

Mr. Knee asked the Board if anyone objects to Trina, Anne, and Jeremiah going next month and Camille, April, and Neil going in March to discuss their assignments. Mr. Chamberlin agreed and stated that there should be a recommended and not recommended list of methods for treatment of historic materials.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that the photos of the document need to be updated and more specific. Mr. Grumbine stated that many new design guidelines have detailed cutaways of houses and architectural elements to allow for the public to easily identify parts of a historic structure. Mrs. Montgomery asked Mr. Grumbine about grant opportunities to fund the design of new guidelines. Mr. Grumbine stated that there are grant opportunities to fund new historic district guidelines, but that would be an internal decision within the Planning Bureau.

Mr. Gaylord stated that all grant applications have to go in front of City Council for approval and that they cannot be independently applied for by departments. Mr. Chamberlin stated that HARB could pull talent from local university students for graphic design to help with the project. Mr. Grumbine agreed and stated that he has interest in exploring that route.

Mrs. Gribble asked to review what the assignments are for the months to come. Mr. Knee stated that each member will fill in the paragraphs for each assigned section and that they have bullet

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 6, 2020**

points for what practices are recommended, not recommended, what is administratively approved, and what practices and materials are administratively denied.

Mr. Knee said by April there should be somewhat of a working document. Mrs. Gribble said that goal is quite ambitious. Mr. Chamberlin asked about the grey areas of materials and practices used for historic structures. Mr. Knee said that those arguments are settled in front of HARB, and that the document will discuss universal truths and accepted practices for historic preservation.

Mr. Knee stated that he was married in November and that he has changed his name officially to AJ Jordan.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:01 PM

Mrs. Rucker moved, and Mrs. Gribble seconded the motion to adjourn. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (7-0) and the meeting adjourned at 7:01 PM.