

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting  
September 13, 2021**

**MINUTES**

**HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD  
REGULAR MEETING  
September 13, 2021  
VIRTUAL MEETING ON ZOOM PLATFORM**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Trina Gribble, Chair  
April Rucker  
Anne Montgomery, Assistant Codes Administrator  
Kali Tennis

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Jeremiah Chamberlin, Vice Chair  
Camille Bennett

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

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

**CALL TO ORDER: 6:00 PM**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Ms. Rucker moved, and Ms. Tennis seconded the motion to Approve the August 2, 2021 minutes. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (4-0).

**OLD BUSINESS:** N/A

**NEW BUSINESS:**

1. **1105 Penn Street, filed by Geoffrey Knight**, to replace an existing single hung first floor wooden window on the primary façade to install a large Fibrex picture window.

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

1. The exterior brick molding, sill, and header shall be repaired or replaced in-kind if necessary and shall not be encapsulated in aluminum or other inappropriate materials.

The case was represented by Geoffrey Knight, 1105 Penn Street, Harrisburg PA 17102 (aka “the Applicant”).

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting  
September 13, 2021**

The Applicant stated that he has been reviewing window replacement for a while and that Andersen is unable to install an in-kind window replacement for the large first floor opening. The Applicant also states that there will be a minimal impact on the character of the district if the window style were to be changed. The Applicant further explained that there are various styles of windows that exist within this specific fenestration in on the block and the replacement would not be completely out of character.

Ms. Tennis asked the Applicant about the window replacement for the other openings. The Applicant stated that the other four windows are being replaced with Fibrex windows of the same style and size without divided lites. Ms. Tennis asked Mr. Grumbine about the precedent for replacement for fibrex windows. Mr. Grumbine stated that Fibrex as a material is administratively approvable as a material for replacement of wood windows as long as the size and style of window are also maintained. Mr. Grumbine stated and the purpose of the HARB review is the change in window style for the large opening on the first floor.

Mrs. Gribble asked if there will be a simulated bar across the window. The Applicant stated that he would prefer to not have the simulated muntin bar across the window. Mrs. Gribble asked if the Board is fine with a single large window rather than a double sash window style. Ms. Montgomery and Ms. Rucker stated they are alright with the change.

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

**2. 1122 Green Street, filed by Craig Campbell of Warehaus**, to convert the existing building into 16 apartments. Alterations include enlarging window openings on secondary facades, replacing existing Jalousie windows with single hung vinyl windows, replace doors with aluminum doors, installing new signage and contemporary materials on the Cumberland and Green Street elevations, redesign of existing canopy, use of metal panels as infill for fenestrations and primary entrance on Green Street, and other minor exterior modifications.

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

1. The Applicant will not remove or encapsulate the exterior brick masonry with an alternative material on the Cumberland Street entrance.
2. The primary entrance on Green Street will be preserved and maintained and shall not be removed, encapsulated, or infilled.
3. The Applicant shall preserve, repair, or retrofit the existing windows in openings that are not being enlarged for the new use. In openings that are being enlarged, the applicant must use an appropriate and compatible window material and type. If wholesale replacement of all windows is approved by the HARB, the new windows within the openings that are not being enlarged must match the lite pattern of the original louvered windows.
4. The proposed façade signage for the corner of Cumberland and Green Streets shall not be

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting  
September 13, 2021**

installed or should be redesigned to be more compatible with the building and setting.

5. Any changes in the proposed material or design must be reviewed and approved by the Planning Bureau and the Harrisburg Architectural Review Board.

The case was represented by Craig Campbell, 231 North George Street York, PA and Jonathan Bowser, 430 North Front Street Wormleysburg, PA (aka “the Applicants”).

The Applicant stated that he knew that the vinyl windows were not acceptable and brought an aluminum casement window sample for the building. The Applicant stated that casement windows are required for egress for fire safety as required by codes. The Applicant stated that the existing window are single pane aluminum windows and cannot be kept due to the change in use and density of the building. The Applicant also explained the infill metal panels are to cover the interior floor systems for the enlarged openings on the secondary facades. The Applicant explained that a wood look metal will be installed under the awning and that the canopy will be reskinned.

Ms. Tennis asked about the infill of the primary entrance on Green Street. The Applicant stated that within the vestibule within the entrance steps up onto the primary floor and that the floor within that area needs to be infilled to be functional. The Applicant stated that the existing storefront system will be removed and infilled with metal panel at the water table and windows above.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant to discuss the signage. The Applicant stated that the signage for the corner of the building will be powder-coated with laser cutouts for the text.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant to discuss the canopy. The Applicant stated that the canopy will be reskinned, new roof, and new fascia with signage.

Mrs. Gribble reiterated the first condition from the Planning Bureau. The Applicant stated that there is existing brick half way up the entrance on Cumberland Street with EFIS above the brick and the original intent was to cover both the brick and EFIS with black metal siding. Mrs. Gribble stated that she would prefer the brick to not be encapsulated. The Applicant stated that they can cut to the chase and they can keep the original brick exposed and just cover the EFIS material with the metal siding and raise the proposed windows above the brick.

Mrs. Gribble stated that the concern is covering the character defining brick pattern on the entrance which is an inappropriate alteration and moving the windows up into the area where there is EFIS. Ms. Tennis feels that the proposal is more appealing than what the Planning Bureau is proposing. Mr. Grumbine stated that the brick pattern is a unique character defining feature of the building and encapsulation of original masonry materials is never recommended as per the Secretary of Interiors Standards and Harrisburg Historic District Design Guidelines. The Applicant stated that they are fine to compromise and agree to the proposed condition of approval.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting  
September 13, 2021**

Mrs. Gribble read the second proposed condition from the Planning Bureau. Mrs. Montgomery asked if there is a way to keep the door of the primary entrance. Mrs. Gribble stated that she also has issues with infilling the primary historic entrance as it is not recommended. The Applicant stated that the brick surround of the entrance is not being impacted and what could be done is that the existing storefront system would be removed and a new storefront system could be reinstalled in the opening and not install the metal paneling. The Applicant stated the entrance could not be functional because it is not accessible.

Mrs. Gribble read the third proposed condition from the Planning Bureau. Mrs. Gribble stated that it appears that reusing the existing windows is not possible due to emergency egress and energy. The Applicant stated there will be single hung, fixed, and casement windows. The Applicant stated that the basement windows will be fixed or casement windows and that the windows will have the horizontal muntins to match the original windows. The Applicant stated that the windows in the enlarged openings will be a mix of window styles. Mrs. Tennis asked about the window sills. The Applicant stated new cast stone sills in the enlarged openings will be used. Ms. Tennis asked if the change in the enlargement of the openings is related to the change in the use of the building. The Applicant stated that is correct.

Mrs. Gribble read the fourth condition from the Planning Bureau regarding the corner signage. Ms. Tennis asked about the size of the signage. The Applicant stated that it is two feet wide and the top sign is 6'9" and the bottom is 10' 8". Ms. Tennis stated that the scale is too big and dominates the corner. Mrs. Tennis asked if it is essential to have the signage on both sides. The Applicant stated that it is not, but is high visibility from both Green and Cumberland Streets. Mrs. Gribble stated that she is not opposed to a corner wrap signage but the proposed signage is too large. Ms. Montgomery agrees and states that the signage takes over the façade of the building and is distracting.

Mrs. Gribble read the fifth condition from the Planning Bureau and read the reasoning for each of the conditions from the Planning Bureau.

Mrs. Gribble asked if the public had any comments. There were no comments.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Board if the first condition is appropriate if the proposed windows are moved above the brick. The Board agreed that the condition as modified is appropriate. Mrs. Gribble asked if the Board is fine with the infill of the original entrance on Green Street for the reuse of the building. Ms. Tennis states that she is fine with it if the entire opening is infilled with glass. Mrs. Gribble stated that she is struggling with the infill of the entrance. The Board agrees to remove the second proposed condition. Mrs. Gribble stated that the third condition should be modified to state that the new aluminum windows shall match the original louvered pattern windows. Mrs. Gribble also feels that the fourth and fifth conditions can remain and are appropriate.

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

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting  
September 13, 2021**

**3. 512 & 514 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, filed by Chris Dawson Architect,** to demolish the existing buildings to construct a new contemporary five story mixed use building.

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

1. The existing buildings have been approved for demolition by the HARB in July of 2018. This is the first a realistic and high impact project has been proposed for new construction. The buildings are derelict, in poor condition, and have been vacant for several years. The proposal would have a positive impact on the neighborhood once concerns of architectural compatibility, particularly on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Street elevation, are evaluated and addressed.

2. The concept of the primary façade was drafted to be intentionally differentiated from the existing building stock as it is an “expression of contemporary design.” As proposed, the proposal would likely visually distract from the existing integrity of the streetscape. The degree of articulation on the primary façade with the deep break of the façade plane to accommodate the balconies is not compatible or consistent with the existing continuity of façade planes along the historic streetscape. Although the incorporation of porches, verandas, or balconies on primary facades does occur within the historic district and even on the same block; the proposed balconies do not reference or utilize historical designs to “blend into the existing built environment” as recommended by the Historic District Design Guidelines.

3. The proposed ratio and density of glazing to solid exterior materials on the primary facade on the balconies, “bay” projection, and storefront system disrupts the typical rhythm and ratios found elsewhere along the historic streetscape. Although a different fenestration pattern can be appropriate, the proposed ratio of fenestration to solid exterior material on the facade is much greater than that of surrounding architecture. Some elements of historic storefronts could be incorporated at the street level or incorporating more solid exterior material along the balconies may balance these proportions. The Historic District Design Guidelines state “The existing ratio of fenestration to solid wall creates a rhythm of solid to void that should be considered in the design of new architecture.”

4. The Historic District Design Guidelines state that “Generally it is more important to have the building compatible with the historic neighborhood than it is to ensure intentional differentiation.” Replication or reproduction is not the goal with new infill construction but the retention of character and continuity of the existing fabric is important to preserve the feel, character, and experience of the historic district. The current proposal is more differentiated than it is compatible and it is recommended that the design is amended to ensure more contiguous architectural harmony with surrounding buildings.

The case was represented by Allison Krichman, 300 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street Harrisburg, PA (aka “the Applicant”).

The Applicant stated that the design of the building is a contemporary structure which is sympathetic to surrounding building materials and that the scale of the building blends both types of elevations to the south and to the north.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting  
September 13, 2021**

Mrs. Gribble stated that she agrees with some of the arguments raised by the Planning Bureau particularly the design of the primary façade and the ratio of glazing to solid material. Ms. Montgomery stated that she feels the building is too contemporary and does not blend in with the existing historic environment as well as it could. Ms. Tennis states that she feels the building is beautiful and would be a welcomed asset to the historic district as a contemporary design. Mrs. Rucker agrees with Ms. Tennis in that new contemporary design is needed in the City.

Discussion ensued about the specific design elements of the primary façade of the proposed design and its compatibility with the streetscape and historic district.

Mrs. Gribble opened the discussion for public comment. Mr. Aronson, 212 Locust Street Harrisburg PA, stated that the existing building are in a state of disrepair and people are squatting in the buildings and making parking unsafe for the lot next door. Mr. Aronson states that the owner of the property should be required to post a bond and have insurance on the buildings given their dilapidated state.

Mrs. Gribble states that tabling the proposal would be appropriate to explore other alternative design options.

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

**OTHER BUSINESS: N/A**

**ADJOURNMENT:** Meeting informally adjourned without vote due to lack of quorum at 8:19PM.