

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
February 3, 2020**

MINUTES

**HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
February 3, 2020
THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. CITY GOVERNMENT CENTER
PUBLIC SAFETY AUDITORIUM, ROOM 213**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Trina Gribble, Vice Chair
Anne Montgomery, Assistant Codes Administrator
Neil Heffelfinger
Camille Bennett
April Rucker

MEMBERS ABSENT: AJ Jordan, Chair
Jeremiah Chamberlin

STAFF PRESENT: Frank Grumbine, Historic Preservation Specialist and Archivist
Tiffanie Baldock, Senior Deputy City Solicitor

OTHERS PRESENT: See attendance signature sheet

CALL TO ORDER: 6:03 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mrs. Bennett moved, and Mrs. Montgomery seconded the motion, to Approve the January 6th minutes. The Board approved the motion to Approve minutes from the October meeting by unanimous vote (5-0).

OLD BUSINESS: N/A

NEW BUSINESS:

1 212 Cumberland Street, filed by Jeb Stuart, to install steel handrails on front stoop.

Mr. Grumbine informed the board that the Jeb Stuart (the Applicant), withdrew the application from consideration and therefore will not have any representatives present at the meeting.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
February 3, 2020**

2 600 Race Street, filed by Andrae Douglas, to install a six-foot tall, wooden, dog eared pressure treated fence to enclose backyard.

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

1. Once the lumber has dried, the fence must be painted or stained.
2. The applicant shall work with the Planning Bureau and the City’s floodplain administrator prior to installation of the fence.
3. The finished, or decorative side of the fence, must face the street

The case was represented by Kyeesha Douglas, 600 Race Street Harrisburg, PA 17104 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant whether they had anything to add to the proposal. The Applicant had nothing to add.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there was a site plan for the fence. Mr. Grumbine said there was a description of the site plan for the fence and that there was a very simple drawing of the fence dimensions.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the fence will enclose both the side and back yard. The Applicant stated that they will be removing the shrubbery on the side of the yard to install the fence and keep an existing tree.

Mrs. Gribble stated that the height of the fence is a zoning issue. Mr. Grumbine stated that the maximum allowable height of the fence is 6 feet. Mrs. Gribble said that fencing in the front yard has to be shorter than the side and back yard. The Applicant stated that there will not be a fence in the front yard. Mr. Grumbine said that a condition can be added for the Applicant to conform to the Zoning Code regarding fencing.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant whether she had any questions about the conditions for the case. The Applicant had no questions.

Mrs. Gribble explained that the lumber must off-gas and dry before applying a paint or stain because the wood won’t be able to absorb the product. Mrs. Rucker agreed and told the Applicant to make sure the wood is dry enough to paint, otherwise it will not adhere.

Mrs. Rucker moved to Approve with conditions, Mrs. Bennett seconded the motion to Approve. The motion was adopted with a unanimous vote (5-0).

3 300 North 3rd Street, filed by Pam Kammerer, to install four pole banners and brackets on façade of structure.

There were no individuals present at the meeting to represent this case.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
February 3, 2020**

- 4 701 North Front Street, filed by YMCA, to replace existing masonry block wall, chains/posts, and guide rail with new masonry pier and steel fence to match western elevation.**

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

1. The proposed masonry piers and fencing, to be installed along North 2nd Street, shall be situated along the property/right-of-way line in a fashion that prohibits parking on the sidewalk adjacent to North 2nd Street.
2. The proposed fence location shall be revised to extend south and straight along the property line/right-of-way area (i.e., adjacent to the sidewalk), parallel to North 2nd Street, to relocated existing parking spaces inside of the fence.

The case was represented by David Maule of Maule and Associates Architects at 395 St. Johns Church Road Camp Hill, PA 17011, Richard Curl and Chad Krebs at 701 North Front Street Harrisburg, PA 17101 (aka the “Applicants”).

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant whether they had anything to add to the proposal. The Applicants stated that the requested conditions are both fair and beneficial to the YMCA. The Applicants also stated that the second condition is problematic due to a legally binding contract between the YMCA and Firestone which allows the garage to use the seven parking spaces.

Mrs. Baldock asked if the Applicants had a copy of that agreement. The Applicants did and gave it to Mrs. Baldock.

The Applicants stated that the proposed masonry piers will be smaller than the ones installed on the Front Street side of the building and felt that they would be too large for the purpose of the fence. The Applicant stated that the appearance would be identical to the design on Front Street.

The Applicants agreed that the fence would be beneficial to the YMCA to extend straight down the sidewalk but due to the legal agreement with Firestone they cannot proceed with such a proposal.

Mrs. Gribble opened up the discussion for public comment. There were no comments.

Mrs. Gribble stated that the second condition from the Planning Bureau will be removed.

Mrs. Bennett motioned, Mrs. Rucker seconded the motion to Approve. The motion was adopted with a unanimous vote (5-0).

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
February 3, 2020**

5 1531 North 2nd Street, filed by William Gipe, to replace a 16-pane wooden casement window with a double hung aluminum clad wood window.

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

1. The proposed replacement of the 16-pane casement window with a double-hung one-over-one aluminum clad wooden window is not an appropriate replacement as per the Secretary of Interior Standards and Harrisburg Historic District Guidelines. All efforts, within reason to repair, rather than replace, the existing historic window should be explored.
2. The existing window is a character defining feature of the structure. The proposal to replace it with a one-over-one double hung window would result in the loss of historic integrity.
3. If HARB moves to approve, the new window should be composed of either solid wood or wood composite material.

The case was represented by William Gipe, 1531 North 2nd Street Harrisburg PA, 17102 (aka the “Applicant”).

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant whether they had anything to add to the proposal. The Applicant stated that the brochures attached with the materials were incorrect and that he intends to use a solid wood window and that the existing window is not weather tight and that it is not an original window but is from the 1930s.

Mrs. Gribble asked what manufacturer of wood window the Applicant will be using. The Applicant said either Interstate, Majesty, or Harvey. Mr. Grumbine stated that the literature that was received by the Planning Bureau stated that the proposed product was an aluminum clad wood window. The Applicant stated that the literature was incorrect and it should have represented an all wood window.

Mrs. Gribble stated that the window is not original based on the brick infill and the size of the window opening. The Applicant stated that the opening size will remain the same.

Mr. Heffelfinger asked whether that is the only window with divided lites. The Applicant stated that the Palladian window has divided lites and the porch enclosure has divided lites as well. Mr. Grumbine said that the majority of the fenestrations are one-over-one wood windows.

Mrs. Gribble asked if there are any objections to the alteration. Mrs. Montgomery said she doesn't have a problem with it. Mr. Grumbine stated that the window, even though not original, has retained historic integrity over time. The Applicant said that he understands and agrees, but it would be more functional to have a double hung window.

Mrs. Bennett stated that she thinks its fine to change it. Mrs. Gribble said that since the rest of the windows are double hung then it wouldn't be changing more significant features of the house.

Mrs. Gribble asked if the Applicant is taking out the entire window and its frame. The Applicant stated that he just plans on replacing the sashes and not the entire frame.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
February 3, 2020**

Mrs. Gribble read the reasons that the Planning Bureau has a recommendation for denial.

Mr. Grumbine explained that the original product that the Applicant proposed was brought before HARB previously and was denied, therefore he suggested to the Applicant to propose a different material.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there is a motion for Approval with a condition that the window will be composed of solid wood. Mr. Grumbine stated that such a condition will be added.

Mrs. Rucker moved to Approve, Mrs. Bennett seconded the motion to Approve with conditions. The motion was adopted with a unanimous vote (5-0).

6 1201 North Front Street, filed by Environmental Products & Services of Vermont, to install one above ground fuel tank, vinyl fencing, and landscape screening.

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

1. The Zoning Code, the Harrisburg historic district design guidelines, and the Secretary of Interior Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties expressly prohibits the installation of vinyl fences in historic districts.
2. The project introduced new construction (concrete pad, above ground fuel tank and vinyl fence) on the building site which is visually incompatible in terms of size, scale, design, material, and color, destroys historic relationships on the site.
3. The introduction and design of a new onsite feature when required by a new use is permitted, however they should be made as unobtrusive as possible and be made compatible with the structure and site.

The case was represented by Steve Vedder of Environmental Products & Services of Vermont at 1539 Bobali Drive Harrisburg, PA 17104 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant whether he had anything to add to the proposal. The Applicant developed a plan to install trees, which would obstruct the view from the right of way, to keep the existing fence. The Applicant stated that the location of the tank and fence was installed because of the location of the building generator. The Applicant said that they used vinyl fencing due to its durability.

Mrs. Gribble asked if there were any comments from the Board. Mrs. Bennett asked if the landscape barrier would be composed of the Blue Point Juniper. The Applicant responded in the affirmative.

Mrs. Montgomery asked how the tank will be filled. The Applicant stated that the tank would be filled from the Cumberland Street side and that a hose will be extended to fill the tank. Mrs. Bennett

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
February 3, 2020**

asked if there was an existing tank. The Applicant stated that the previous tanks were underground because they were an environmental liability for the property owner.

Mrs. Baldock asked the Applicant whether there are any DEP regulations to require the tank to be enclosed. The Applicant stated that its more of a security issue for traffic around the tank.

Mrs. Gribble asked about how that the landscape screen obscure the view of the fence from all public right of ways. The Applicant stated that the landscape screening would only obscure the view of the fence from Front Street.

Mrs. Gribble said that she has a problem with the material of the fence, but commends the gesture to obscure the fence. Mrs. Gribble stated that even though the building is much different than the typical building stock in the historic district, its materials are compatible despite the vinyl fence. Mrs. Rucker suggested that the Applicant should use wood instead.

Mrs. Gribble said that there are various materials and options available to use rather than vinyl and that she has an issue with PVC from because that is a precedent issue moving forward for other cases in historic districts.

Mrs. Gribble restated the reasons for denial from the Planning Bureau.

Mrs. Baldock asked if the fence would be visible from Cumberland and Verbeke Streets. The Applicant stated that it would be. Mrs. Baldock asked whether additional trees could be planted to obscure the view of the fence. The Applicant stated that they could plant additional trees to obstruct the view. Mrs. Gribble said that she feels that the Board should not vote on whether they should move to approve measures to obstruct existing features and feels that it could be problematic in the future.

The Applicant asked if the fence material was changed to wood of proper construction then would the trees be required. The Board said the trees would not be required if the material of the fence was changed to wood. The Applicant said that the number of trees to obscure the view of the fence would be too great and that the owner wants the issue resolved and that if the material of the fence would be changed to wood, then the owners of the building would likely be acceptable to that. The Applicant stated that a wooden fence would be an acceptable compromise.

Mrs. Gribble asked Mr. Grumbine if he would have a wooden fence come to HARB. Mr. Grumbine said the Board can approve of a wooden fence for the case at the meeting. Mrs. Baldock asked Mr. Grumbine that if the Applicant does use a wooden fence then can he administratively approve it. Mr. Grumbine said that if the Board gives him permission to administratively approve the design of the wooden fence, then he will do so. The Applicant asked Mr. Grumbine if the new wooden fence is similar in design to the existing vinyl fence then would it be approved. Mr. Grumbine said the Board can make a condition of approval for that proposal then approve the case. Mrs. Gribble said that the material will be changed to wood and composed of a similar style to the existing fence and painted or stained.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
February 3, 2020**

Mrs. Rucker said that she would make an amendment to approve with the condition that a wooden fence will replace the vinyl fence and be painted or stained and must meet all the zoning requirements.

The Applicant asked whether pressure treated lumber is acceptable. Mrs. Gribble said yes, as long as it is painted.

Mr. Grumbine asked that the Board wants a condition stating that the fence will be constructed of wood similar to the existing fence and that the fence will conform to existing zoning code.

Mrs. Baldock asked if the fence is in the RF district. Mr. Grumbine said it is. Mrs. Baldock said that such a fence would require a special exception for zoning because it faces Front Street.

Mrs. Bennett moved to Approve, Mrs. Montgomery seconded the motion to Approve with conditions. The motion was adopted with a unanimous vote (5-0).

300 North 3rd Street, filed by Pam Kammerer, to install four pole banners and brackets on façade of structure.

Mrs. Gribble asked if anyone has arrived to represent the case. Nobody arrived to represent the case. Mrs. Gribble asked if the Board can have a discussion regarding the case. Mrs. Baldock said that they can have a discussion but no action can be taken and that when someone doesn't show then usually the case gets tabled. Mrs. Gribble asked the Board to discuss the case.

Mr. Grumbine gave a synopsis of the case report. Mr. Grumbine stated that the Applicant should be present to discuss the location for the pole banner brackets as their location will be difficult given the coursing of the masonry of the building. Mrs. Gribble agreed. Mr. Grumbine said that he believes that the Applicant stated that they will need to use new brackets but is not sure. Mr. Grumbine said that the Board can give him permission to administratively approve the case if the Applicant was not able to access the building.

Mrs. Gribble said that if the Applicant tried to come to the meeting then the Board gives Mr. Grumbine permission to administratively approve the location of pole banner brackets.

Mrs. Bennett moved to Approve, Mrs. Montgomery seconded the motion to Approve. The motion was adopted with a unanimous vote (5-0).

OTHER BUSINESS:

1 Discussion on historic district guidelines.

Mrs. Rucker inquired about the formatting of the guidelines discussed at the last meeting and wanted that to be clarified. Mr. Grumbine said he believes that they discussed a table which would designate "recommended" and "not recommended" treatments for historic structures. Mr. Grumbine said that it is written in the previous month's minutes.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
February 3, 2020**

Mrs. Gribble said that Anne and herself can present their sections that they have prepared. Mrs. Gribble said that she will go first. Mrs. Gribble said she has the sections of additions, demolitions, and new construction. Mrs. Gribble read through the revised section titled “Additions.”

Mrs. Gribble asked for feedback for the first part of the section. Mr. Grumbine said that the information should be inclusive but it should also be a readable document and said that its difficult to find that balance. Mr. Grumbine said that this balance can change with banners, photos, and other graphic images. Mr. Grumbine said the formatting will be a big challenge moving forward. Mrs. Gribble said it will be best to have more language when they have a contentious case.

Mr. Grumbine said that if HARB decisions are based on both the Secretary of Interior Standards and the Harrisburg Historic District guidelines, then the guidelines should be more specific to Harrisburg because they already use the Secretary of Interior Standards as part of their justification on cases.

Mr. Grumbine said he would like to see a case study for each section which would allow for the document to become more personal and it would allow for the document to come to life. He said that each chapter would use a case study to refer to for appropriate or not appropriate treatments which would make the document more relevant to Harrisburg’s historic districts. Mrs. Gribble said that she thinks that is a good idea. Mr. Grumbine said that it would give potential applicants a perspective on the other side of the architectural review. Mr. Grumbine said a bunch of details from the federal government outlined in their local guidelines is not relatable, whereas local case studies are tangible examples. Mrs. Gribble said a small summary, then a case study, then another non-compliant case study, then the recommended-not recommended table for each chapter could be the format for the document moving forward. Mr. Grumbine said that sounds like a good format. Mr. Grumbine also said that exploded or cutaway diagrams of architectural features is also important for homeowners to educate themselves.

Mrs. Gribble said all the quotes from the Secretary of Interior Standards could be included in a sidebar within the chapter. Mrs. Gribble continued to read through the section titled “new construction.” Mrs. Gribble asked for feedback on the chapter. Mr. Grumbine stated that the addition of case studies would speak for themselves and that he likes the format of each section within the chapter.

Mrs. Gribble read through the chapter titled “demolition.” Discussion ensued about the application process for demolitions. Mrs. Baldock said that the issue with demolitions is that there is no requirement that makes applicants supply a report stating that the buildings are not structurally sound from an engineer and that it is incumbent on HARB to state that the building is sound. Mrs. Gribble said that it could be problematic for HARB to identify whether structures are sound or unsound for demolition. Mr. Grumbine said self-reporting and conflict of interest would be an issue with developing a structural report. Mrs. Gribble said third party engineers need to be independent and be objective in their review of the building. Mrs. Baldock its something to think about and would require more research in how other places perform demolitions in historic district. Mrs. Bennett said that there is already a process for demolition through HARB and that the majority of the properties that are being demolished are already

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
February 3, 2020**

falling down. Mrs. Gribble said demolition needs to be addressed because there are many people who are bad actors and will destabilize a building in order to demolish it.

Mrs. Gribble read through the section titled “building relocation.” Mrs. Gribble asked for feedback on the section. Mr. Grumbine said that building relocation usually does not occur in Harrisburg but there are many local cases in Lancaster and Chester counties that could be included in the guidelines.

Mrs. Gribble read through the section titled “architectural salvage.” Mrs. Gribble asked for feedback on this section. There were no comments on this section.

Mrs. Montgomery stated that the Codes Bureau does not follow ADAAG anymore but would insert the most recent code that is followed such as ANSI 2009. Mrs. Montgomery said that these will likely also change. Mrs. Gribble said that she would just state in the guidelines to check with codes for most current documents. Mrs. Montgomery said that all the ADA photos need updated and that zoning considerations need to be evaluated and updated as well. Mr. Grumbine said that many of the same considerations for ADA ramps and lifts follow those of new additions. Mrs. Baldock inferred that federal policy influences ADA requirements and that HARB has little influence, other than design, over this. Mrs. Rucker said that ADA lifts are very specific and depend on the building and site and that nothing is universal.

Mrs. Gribble said that if lifts or ramps are removed then that the site and building should be restored to its original condition. Mrs. Baldock said that there is a big difference between commercial ADA use and residential ADA use and they would be viewed differently.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:32 PM

Mrs. Bennett moved, and Mrs. Rucker seconded the motion to adjourn. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (5-0) and the meeting adjourned at 8:04 PM.