

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
April 5, 2021**

MINUTES

**HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
April 5, 2021
VIRTUAL MEETING ON ZOOM PLATFORM**

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jeremiah Chamberlin, Vice Chair
Anne Montgomery, Assistant Codes Administrator
April Rucker
Kali Tennis

MEMBERS ABSENT: Trina Gribble, Chair
Camille Bennett

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

OTHERS PRESENT: David & Elaine Bomberger-Schmotzer
Gerry Garber
Jim Heisey

CALL TO ORDER: 6:05 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Ms. Montgomery moved, and Ms. Tennis seconded the motion to Approve the March 1st, 2021 minutes. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (4-0).

OLD BUSINESS: N/A

NEW BUSINESS:

1. 110 Boas Street, filed by David Bomberger-Schmotzer, to replace an existing historic slate roof with a synthetic slate roof.

Mr. Grumbine gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved with the following condition(s):

1. The new synthetic slate material shall match the existing historic slate in reveal, color, size, and dimension.
2. Associated roof architectural features including trim, chimneys, dormers, eaves, or gables shall be preserved or repaired in-kind if needed.
3. If possible, slate shingles shall be saved or donated for use on other historic slate roofs for repair.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
April 5, 2021**

The case was represented by David and Elaine Bomberger-Schmotzer, Harrisburg PA 17102 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mr. Chamberlin asked if the Applicants had anything to add to the proposal. The Applicants had nothing to add. Mr. Chamberlin asked if there were any comments from the Board. Ms. Montgomery asked the Applicants if they are agreeable to the proposed conditions from the Planning Bureau. The Applicants agreed to the conditions.

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

Ms. Rucker moved; Ms. Montgomery seconded the motion to Approve with Conditions. The motion was adopted with a unanimous vote (4-0).

2. 221 North Front Street, filed by St. Stephen’s Episcopal Cathedral, to install an eight-foot-long by six-foot-tall aluminum fence over the brick path to the north of the church.

Mr. Grumbine gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved with the following condition(s):

1. The fence shall not be anchored or attached to the buildings. If anchoring is necessary, anchors must be installed through mortar joints and will not damage historic brick.

The case was represented by Gerry Garber, 221 North Front Street Harrisburg, PA 17101 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mr. Chamberlin asked for comments from the Board. Ms. Tennis asked the applicant the distance from the street to the proposed fence. The Applicant stated that it would be minimally visible from front street. The Applicant stated from the curb to the fence is a distance of 64 feet and will sit back twenty feet from the front of the church.

Ms. Rucker said that the fence installation is a good idea to protect the children in the play area. Mr. Chamberlin asked if the proposed fence looks like a wrought iron fence. The Applicant stated that it will appear as if it is a wrought iron fence.

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

Ms. Tennis moved; Ms. Rucker seconded the motion to Approve with Conditions. The motion was adopted with a unanimous vote (4-0).

3. 1917 North 2nd Street, filed by Accessibility Solutions 360, to construct a new porch deck onto the existing porch, install a concrete path, install a wheelchair lift, construct a wood retention wall, redesign part of the baluster and rail system, and construct a raised deck platform on the existing front porch.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
April 5, 2021**

Mr. Grumbine gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved with the following condition(s):

1. The proposed western porch extension will not be constructed. The lift shall be situated on the southern elevation of the existing historic porch.
2. Any retaining wall that is necessary due to excavation shall not be constructed from lumber and shall be constructed of masonry that is compatible with the historic setting.
3. The existing balusters and rails on the southern elevation shall be saved for future re-installation for future homeowners if removed. Any new rail and balustrade system that must be installed on the southern elevation to accommodate the lift shall match the existing historic features in material, size, style, appearance, and texture.
4. The proposed new raised porch floor shall match the existing porch floor in material and design and be painted.
5. The Applicant shall submit a Floodplain Development Permit Application and receive approval from the City's floodplain administrator prior to construction.

The case was represented by Jim Heisey, 240 Stony Creek Way, Millerstown PA 17062 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mr. Chamberlin asked if the Applicant had anything to add to the proposal. The Applicant asked for the first proposed condition from the Planning Bureau to be clarified. Mr. Grumbine reiterated the first condition proposed by the Planning Bureau regarding the proposed porch extension.

Mr. Chamberlin asked Mr. Grumbine to clarify the condition of the location of the wheelchair lift. Mr. Grumbine stated that the proposed western extension of the project will not be constructed and the wheelchair lift will be located on the southern side of the existing historic porch which will minimize the visual impact on the historic porch. The Applicant said that he understands the change and that it will be fantastic and that the lift will be minimally visible.

Mr. Chamberlin asked for comments from the Board. Ms. Tennis said she is confused about the perspective of the site plan and asked for clarification. Ms. Montgomery and Mr. Chamberlin stated that the location of the lift will be relocated east to the southern elevation of the historic porch. Ms. Montgomery stated that the lift will be in between the houses. Mr. Chamberlin shared his screen to the Board to visualize where the lift will be located to the side of the porch.

Ms. Tennis asked about the proposed steps and platform. Mr. Grumbine stated that the proposed extension will not be constructed as per the proposed condition and that the lift will be to the side of the porch and that the proposed new steps will not be constructed. The Applicant agreed and stated that the new steps would not be constructed since the platform will not be constructed. Ms. Montgomery asked the Applicant if the porch platform will still be constructed. The Applicant stated that the porch platform would still be constructed to eliminate the rise from the porch to the door. The Applicant stated that the original porch would remain.

Ms. Tennis asked about the relocation of the existing handrails. The Applicant stated that the existing handrails would have been relocated to the new concrete steps, which will not occur

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
April 5, 2021**

because the new steps will not be constructed. The Applicant stated that the existing metal gate will be reinstalled at a different grade.

Mr. Chamberlin asked if there is enough space for the lift to be installed on the side due to the property line. The Applicant stated that there should be enough room but the installation will be very close to the property line. The Applicant stated that the platform will match the existing porch as best as possible.

Mr. Chamberlin asked if the historic rail and baluster system can be stored on site in the house for future re-installation for future homeowners. The Applicant stated that there is a dry basement that the rails and balusters can be stored in at the property.

Ms. Tennis asked Mr. Chamberlin where the location of the lift will be as per the Planning Bureau's proposed condition. Mr. Chamberlin illustrated the location of the lift to the southern side of the historic porch via screen share. Ms. Tennis stated that she feels that it is a good solution. Mr. Chamberlin agrees and stated that his biggest concern was whether or not the lift could be installed on the side of the property. Mr. Grumbine stated that it is a good solution to accommodate accessibility and historic preservation.

Mr. Grumbine explained that the Applicant shall coordinate with the Planning Bureau regarding the floodplain development permit process. Mr. Heisey asked if a new building permit would need to be submitted. Mrs. Montgomery stated that a new building permit with an accurate site plan would need to be submitted.

Ms. Rucker moved; Ms. Montgomery seconded the motion to Approve with Conditions. The motion was adopted with a unanimous vote (4-0).

OTHER BUSINESS:

1 Discussion on historic district guidelines.

Mr. Grumbine described the progress he has made on the new historic district design guidelines. Mr. Grumbine stated that the Planning Bureau held two public meetings to introduce the new design guidelines on March 18th and 25th. Mr. Grumbine stated that the meetings were sparsely attended but are posted on YouTube for viewing. Mr. Grumbine stated that he plans on the HARB voting to approve the new guidelines at the May 3rd meeting. Mr. Gaylord stated that City Council will have to vote on the new document and that City Council could potentially review the document on May 11th or 18th and that the document could be implemented by June.

ADJOURNMENT: 6:46 PM

Ms. Montgomery moved, and Ms. Rucker seconded the motion to adjourn. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (4-0) and the meeting adjourned at 6:46PM.