

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting  
August 2, 2021**

**MINUTES**

**HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING  
August 2, 2021  
VIRTUAL MEETING ON ZOOM PLATFORM**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Trina Gribble, Chair  
Jeremiah Chamberlin, Vice Chair  
April Rucker, Arrived at 6:15PM  
Camille Bennett  
Kali Tennis

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Anne Montgomery, Assistant Codes Administrator

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

**OTHERS PRESENT:** See Sign-in Sheet

**CALL TO ORDER: 6:07 PM**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Tennis moved, and Mr. Chamberlin seconded the motion to Approve the July 12, 2021 minutes. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (4-0).

**OLD BUSINESS:** N/A

**NEW BUSINESS:**

**1. 254 Calder Street, filed by Jarvis Brown, to remove an existing single hung wooden window on the first floor of the primary façade to install a new double-hung aluminum clad wood window of the same size.**

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

1. The new window must be the same size and style (one over one single or double hung) as the original window and the new window must be paintable.
2. The stone header, sill, or brick around the opening must not be modified, damaged, or removed to accommodate the new window. Additionally, the opening must not be modified or framed out to accommodate a smaller window.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting  
August 2, 2021**

3. Aluminum coil will not be used to wrap any exterior profiles or trim of the window.

The case was represented by Jarvis Brown 254 Calder Street, Harrisburg PA 17102 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mrs. Gribble asked if the Applicant had anything to add to the proposal. The Applicant stated that he attempted to perform his due diligence in regards to the historic district requirements but also kept cost of the window in mind as well.

Mrs. Gribble opened the discussion to the Board. Mrs. Tennis asked about the product specifications. The Applicant stated that the window is a Pella Reserve aluminum clad window.

Mrs. Gribble asked Mr. Grumbine about the condition regarding the use of aluminum coil on the exterior. Mr. Grumbine stated that the condition is referring to the use of aluminum coil to wrap the brick molding on the exterior of the window frame not the window itself. Mrs. Gribble stated that the HARB usually does not approve the use of aluminum clad wood windows.

Mr. Chamberlin asked if Pella makes a real wood window. The Applicant stated that this is the product they referred to him when asking for a real wood window. The Applicant also stated that he would not have moved towards a wood type window without the requirements of the historic district design guidelines. The Applicant also stated that aluminum clad is much better than the use of vinyl or other materials.

Ms. Tennis asked the Applicant if he is replacing the window due to energy efficiency. The Applicant stated that energy efficiency is the primary reason for replacing the window and the fact that the window is separating from the opening. The Applicant also stated that the window is inoperable and leaks during heavy storms.

Ms. Tennis stated that the new window sounds like a net improvement and stated that she is very familiar with the product and feels that it is an appropriate replacement and is a sound choice for a replacement and that she supports the replacement.

Mrs. Rucker asked the Applicant if the window is paintable. The Applicant stated that he is ordering it already painted but believes that the window is paintable. The Applicant also stated that the exterior window frame will be painted wood and will not be wrapped in aluminum coil. The Applicant also stated that he will make every effort to maintain the same appearance of the existing window. Mrs. Gribble asked if the new window will have any muntin bars. The Applicant stated that the window will not have any grills or bars and will be one over one in appearance. The Applicant stated that he purposefully would not opt for a \$4,000 window and would go for something cheaper but wants to maintain the historic character of the building.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that he wishes he could see what the window looks like and how the aluminum cladding is applied to the window. Ms. Tennis asked if there were any case studies regarding this type of window or something of this nature. Mr. Grumbine explained that the HARB approved of large picture windows on Green and Susquehanna Streets in the past year. Mr. Grumbine stated that he personally prefers the use of a different type of material and maintain the

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting  
August 2, 2021**

same style of window than having a more appropriate material and installing a large picture window which disrupts the fenestration patterns along the streetscape.

Mrs. Gribble read the proposed conditions of approval from the Planning Bureau.

Ms. Bennett moved; Ms. Rucker seconded the motion to Approve with Conditions. The motion was adopted with a unanimous vote (5-0).

**2. 218 Boas Street, filed by Service 1<sup>st</sup> Restoration, to remove an existing historic 2<sup>nd</sup> floor porch on the rear of the building to enclose it for interior use.**

Mr. Grumbine gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Denied for the following reason(s):

1. The proposed addition will permanently remove the character defining historic rear porch, projecting porch roof, and window opening which have existed since at the last decade of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The alteration would have an adverse impact on the character of the building and built environment. The Secretary of Interior Standards state that “Enclosing porches in a manner that results in a diminution or loss of historic character by using solid materials rather than clear glazing, or by placing the enclosure in front of, rather than behind, the historic features” is not recommended. Although the existing railings and balusters are not original, the porch itself is a historic character defining feature to the building. Additionally, the Secretary of Interior Standards state that “Attaching a new addition in a manner that obscures, damages, or destroys character-defining features of the historic building” is not recommended. The Harrisburg Historic District Design Guidelines also state “Altering or modifying intact historic porches is rarely appropriate and is not recommended.”
2. Some of the proposed materials and products (vinyl siding & soffit, steel door) for the project are not compatible nor appropriate for use within municipal historic districts as per the Harrisburg Historic District Design Guidelines.
3. As is, the proposed porch removal and enclosure would have an adverse effect on the integrity of the historic building as a significant architectural feature would be lost. If HARB approves or tables the proposal, the Board should consider appropriate exterior materials and designs which would be more compatible with the historic building and its environment.

The case was represented by Jeffrey Copus 218 Boas Street Harrisburg, PA 17102 and Matthew Brought from Service 1<sup>st</sup> Restoration (aka “the Applicants”).

Mr. Grumbine stated that some of the information in the reasons for denial may no longer be applicable given the recently submitted changes to the application and design of the proposal.

The Applicant stated that Mr. Grumbine stopped by his house and had a conversation to discuss the issues regarding the proposal thus resulting in the changes submitted a couple of days prior to the HARB meeting.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting  
August 2, 2021**

The Applicant stated that a nearby mulberry tree fell and damaged his property and decided to move forward with new alterations while the house will be under construction due to repair of the damages.

The Applicant stated that they plan on adding a bathroom into the existing second floor porch, repairing the roof from the damage, and adding a new free-standing porch similar to the existing historic porch.

Ms. Tennis was asking about the projecting first floor porch roof. The Applicants explained that the new porch and projecting roof will extend off the back of where the original porch ended and that the once existing porch roof on the first floor will not be reconstructed.

Mr. Chamberlin asked about the type and location of the window on the western elevation in the new enclosure addition. The Applicants stated that they wanted to have a long narrow window but after conversations with Mr. Grumbine that type of window would not be appropriate. The Applicant stated that they would match the new window opening by replicating the existing attic opening. The Applicants also explained that the original submission was based on the insurance claim which was an exact in-kind match replacement of all the materials that were damaged and after conversations with Mr. Grumbine the historic district regulations would not allow for the use of these materials thus necessitating the change toward more appropriate historic materials.

Mr. Chamberlin was inquiring about the type of wood siding that they will be using for the new addition and repairs. The Applicant stated that they would match it with the historic siding that is located on the façade of the house. Mr. Chamberlin asked about the location of the new small window on the western elevation. The Applicants stated that they would attempt to center the window above the first-floor window as closely as possible. Mrs. Gribble stated that she is mostly concerned about packing out the edges of the new window. Mr. Grumbine stated that a different size window in that location would differentiate it from the rest of the building thus indicating that it is a later alteration.

Mr. Chamberlin asked the Applicants about the proposed style of balusters. The Applicant stated that the existing balusters are not original. Mr. Grumbine stated that the existing posts are historically appropriate as they have the chamfered corners typical of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century whereas the rails and balusters are not more than thirty years old as they are one by three balusters with basic rails which are not historically appropriate.

Mrs. Tennis asked about the type of doors on the first and second floors. The Applicant stated that the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor door would be wood and the first-floor door would still be a sliding glass patio door. Mr. Grumbine stated that the first-floor door is minimally visible from a public right of way due to the fence. The Applicant stated that the tree hit the door and roof and it requires replacement and repair.

Mrs. Tennis inquired about potential conditions of approval. Mr. Chamberlin stated that conditions of approval should pertain to the types and designs of materials related to the alterations. Discussion ensued regarding the appropriate style of balusters for the new porch. Mr. Grumbine stated that the sawn balusters would likely be the most appropriate for the new porch.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting  
August 2, 2021**

Mr. Chamberlin agreed. Mrs. Gribble stated that a condition of approval could be delegated to the Planning Bureau regarding the design of the porch. Mrs. Gribble stated that she does not want to design the porch for the Applicants. Mr. Grumbine stated that a condition of approval for the porch could be broad regarding the style and materials for the new porch.

Ms. Tennis stated that the proposed conditions of approval are in regard to the window placement, window trim, type of siding, and porch materials. Mrs. Gribble asked if the applicant will have beaded porch ceilings. The Applicant stated that the existing porch has a vinyl ceiling and would prefer the beaded ceiling. Mr. Grumbine stated that the issue with new porches or decks in historic districts is that they often look like typical suburban decks and detract from the character of the district and that utilizing more appropriate details would ensure its compatibility.

Mr. Chamberlin asked Mr. Grumbine if he was able to capture the proposed conditions of approval. Mr. Grumbine stated that the first condition is that the new window will be stacked above the first-floor window, the second condition is that the new clapboard will match the existing style and reveal of the existing historic wooden siding, the third condition states that the new window trim shall match the existing historic window trim, the fourth condition is related to the new porch design and style.

Mr. Grumbine stated that the Applicant can submit a more specific design and material list for the new porch and the Board could give him the ability to administratively approve the design of the new porch. Ms. Tennis agreed to that option. Mr. Gaylord stated that the HARB can give Mr. Grumbine the ability to administratively approve the final design but the condition must explicitly state as such. Mr. Chamberlin stated that he would agree to allow Mr. Grumbine to approve a final appropriate design for the porch. Mrs. Gribble stated that the new submission is more appropriate than the original submission.

Mrs. Gribble stated that the final condition will be that the final design and materials will be submitted to the Planning Bureau for final design review and if these materials and designs are found to be architecturally satisfactory then the HARB gives the Planning Bureau the ability to approve the final project.

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

**OTHER BUSINESS: N/A**

**ADJOURNMENT: 7:05 PM**

Mr. Chamberlin moved, and Ms. Bennett seconded the motion to adjourn. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (5-0) and the meeting adjourned at 7:05 PM.