

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
October 5, 2020**

MINUTES

**HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
October 5, 2020
VIRTUAL MEETING ON ZOOM PLATFORM**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Trina Gribble, Chair
Jeremiah Chamberlin, Vice Chair
Anne Montgomery, Assistant Codes Administrator
Camille Bennett

MEMBERS ABSENT: April Rucker

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

OTHERS PRESENT: Christopher and Erica Bryce, Applicants
Christine Bair, City Resident

CALL TO ORDER: 6:02 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mrs. Bennett moved, and Mrs. Montgomery seconded the motion to Approve the August 3rd minutes. The Board approved the motion to Approve minutes from the August meeting by unanimous vote (4-0).

Mrs. Montgomery moved, and Mrs. Bennett seconded the motion to Approve the September 14th minutes. The Board approved the motion to Approve minutes from the September meeting by unanimous vote (4-0).

OLD BUSINESS: N/A

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. 921 Bartine Street, filed by Christopher Bryce, to remove several historic window and door openings, to add a new window opening, relocate door to rear, and to install new windows and siding.**

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
October 5, 2020**

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

1. All historic window and door openings on the Union Street façade shall be retained.
2. New openings shall be plain in design without trim or period architectural surrounds and shall be distinguishable from historic openings.
3. The new door and door frame shall be composed of wood and be painted.
4. All new windows shall match their original pane configurations.

The case was represented by Christopher and Erica Bryce, 2901 North Front Street Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka “the Applicants”).

Mrs. Gribble asked if the Applicant had anything to add to the proposal. The Applicants stated that they purchased the building due to its proximity to their existing property and wanted to improve the state of the building as it requires extensive repair. The Applicants also stated that there are existing structural issues with the property that require attention. The Applicants stated that the rear portion of the house dates back to the 1920’s and that some of the existing windows are causing structural issues due to their location. The Applicants also stated that the electrical service for the building runs underneath the side door which is stated to be a massive safety issue. The Applicants continued to state that some of the proposed changes are for structural reasons and that the removal and relocation of the side door is purely aesthetic. The Applicants stated that they want to make the building more functional for modern use and that the house is located on two less traveled alleys.

Mrs. Bennett asked if the building is structurally unsound then why is there a proposal to install an additional window on the southern elevation. The Applicants stated that the proposed new window would be between two existing structural members and would not impact the structural integrity of the property.

Mrs. Bennett asked if the windows being proposed to be removed could be replaced. The Applicants stated that there are structural issues and that the gutter feeds water directly into the window and that the existing windows cut into the structural components of the building.

Mrs. Gribble confirmed which openings are being removed and that the door is being moved to the rear elevation. Mrs. Gribble asked for input from the Board.

Mrs. Bennett asked if they are proposing to remove the side door to enhance the interior space of the new kitchen. The Applicants stated that is correct. Mrs. Bennett stated that the proposal is to alter the historic design of the property to make it more appealing to a potential tenant. The Applicants stated that there are both structural issues and that the relocation of the rear door is purely aesthetic.

Mr. Chamberlin asked what the applicants are asking from the Board in regard to the type of windows for the property. The Applicants stated that they spoke to Mr. Grumbine regarding the original window configurations and he believed that the original windows were likely six over six.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
October 5, 2020**

The Applicants stated that the functionality of living is necessary to allow for the use of historic buildings. Mrs. Bennett stated that she is against this project.

Mrs. Gribble asked if the existing door frame and architectural materials are salvageable for the new rear door opening. The Applicants stated that it is possible to do so.

Mr. Chamberlin asked if the newly proposed window should be in line with the existing windows. The Applicants stated it is not possible due to the location of structural elements and the location of the stairs. Mr. Chamberlin stated that the changes on the back half of the building seem to be alright with him but would request that the new door should be composed of wood. Mr. Chamberlin stated that having a cohesive style of window on the house would make sense.

Mrs. Gribble asked about the trim around the windows and the exposure of the new siding. The Applicants stated that they would like to replicate exactly what exists on the house currently.

Mr. Chamberlin asked if the Applicants plan on replicating the German lapboard that is currently on the house. Mr. Chamberlin stated that he would like to see the same type of siding installed on the house. The Applicants stated that there are available products that they can use to match the original type of siding.

Mrs. Bennett asked why the Applicants are proposing to remove the eastern window on the rear of the house. The Applicants confirmed the location of each of the two windows proposed to be removed and stated that the downspout is located directly in front of the eastern facing window. Mrs. Gribble stated that the downspout can be relocated. The Applicant stated that the location of the window in relation to the gutter is problematic and water infiltrates into the window and is structurally unsound.

Mrs. Gribble opened up the discussion for public input. Mrs. Christine Bair, 907 North Front Street Harrisburg, PA, stated that she is in favor of the work being proposed to the property as it has been poorly maintained and has been attracting suspicious activity.

Mrs. Gribble read through the Planning Bureau's recommended conditions of approval. Mrs. Gribble stated that she does not have an issue with relocating the door to the proposed location. Mrs. Montgomery stated that she does not have an issue with the new door opening. Mrs. Bennett stated her opposition to the relocation of the door opening. Mrs. Montgomery stated that the removal of the door opening on the side would look strange as the façade would appear to be off balance. The Applicants stated that they are able to install a window into the original door opening if necessary. Mrs. Gribble agreed and believed that there should be a window in the original door opening.

Mrs. Gribble read the second condition of approval and asked Mr. Grumbine for clarity. Mr. Grumbine stated that new openings on historic buildings should be differentiated from original historic openings and should not have trim or other architectural features which replicate those from the period of construction. Mr. Grumbine stated that this condition comes directly from the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Mr. Chamberlin states that he disagrees with this recommendation from the Secretary of Interior's Standards. Mr. Chamberlin stated that all aspects

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
October 5, 2020**

of the exterior should be cohesive and be matching. Mrs. Gribble stated that she agreed. The Applicants stated that there are several types of window trims on the building. Mr. Chamberlin stated he would prefer to see one harmonious type of trim across the building. Mrs. Gribble stated that ornamental trim should be on the primary façade and other parts of the property can have simpler trim.

Mrs. Gribble read the third condition from the Planning Bureau. The Applicants agreed that they would be able to use a wood door and trim for the new door and opening on the rear of the house.

Mrs. Gribble read the fourth condition from the Planning Bureau. The Applicants stated that there are several different types of windows in the property including two over two and six over six windows. Mr. Chamberlin described the various styles of windows throughout the house. Mr. Grumbine stated that the original structure is dated sometime between 1850-1860 and stated that six over six windows would have been common in that period.

Mrs. Gribble stated that small stair windows should be two over two, and the façade, side, and back should be six over six. Mr. Chamberlin stated that the dormer should remain as two over two. Mrs. Gribble asked if the dormer window is being replaced. The Applicants stated that it is being replaced and they can install a two over two. The Applicants stated that the stair windows are a single casement window. Mrs. Gribble stated that the southside attic window is a four lite window. The Applicant stated that they will install a four lite window in the attic.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that the various window styles should be built into a condition of approval. Mrs. Gribble stated that the existing condition should be modified to state that all new windows shall match their original pane configuration as follows: the primary façade shall have six over six, the dormer shall be two over two, south façade windows shall be six over six, and the stair windows shall be four lite, and on the rear façade all windows shall be six over six.

Mrs. Gribble stated that the new door and door frame shall be composed of wood and be painted. Mrs. Gribble stated that the second Condition regarding the window trim can be removed. Mrs. Montgomery and Mrs. Bennett agreed. Mr. Chamberlin stated that trim on each façade shall be coherent and replicate the historic profiles for each façade.

Mrs. Gribble read the first condition from the Planning Bureau regarding the preservation of the openings on Union Street. Mrs. Gribble stated that she feels that it is appropriate to remove the proposed windows and doors on this façade. Mrs. Gribble stated that she does not feel the new window on the southern façade is appropriate. Mrs. Gribble agreed that she does not feel it is appropriate. Mrs. Montgomery stated that she feels the removal of the two original windows is appropriate. Mr. Chamberlin agreed and added that a new window should be installed in the original door opening on the southern façade.

The Applicant asked if it is possible to make the first-floor window on the east elevation smaller to accommodate trim. Mr. Chamberlin stated that he disagrees and enjoys the quirkiness of how the window does not fit correctly as it conveys its historic nature.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
October 5, 2020**

Mr. Grumbine read that the first condition of approval will state: a new window opening will be installed in the original door opening to match adjacent window, the original second condition has been removed, the next condition will state that each façade shall have consistent yet historically contextual trim design to the building, and the last condition will state that the new windows shall replicate the pane configuration of the original windows as follows: front dormer 2/2, stair openings will be 4 lite, and the primary, south, and rear facades will have 6/6 windows.

Mrs. Gribble asked for a motion.

Mr. Chamberlin moved with modified conditions; Mrs. Montgomery seconded the motion to Approve the request with modified conditions. The motion was adopted with a majority vote with Mrs. Bennett dissenting (3-1).

OTHER BUSINESS:

1 Discussion on historic district guidelines.

Mr. Grumbine stated not much as changed in regards to the guidelines from the previous month. Mr. Grumbine stated that he is wrapping up rehabilitation section of the guidelines and will be working on the final sections of the document this month. Mr. Grumbine stated that once there is a preliminary draft he will send the document to all the HARB members for input on the document and then the Board can plan on having a public webinar series to gain some public input on the new document.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:03 PM

Mr. Chamberlin moved, and Mrs. Montgomery seconded the motion to adjourn. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (4-0) and the meeting adjourned at 7:38 PM.