

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
November 1, 2021**

MINUTES

**HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
November 1, 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, City Solicitor

OTHERS PRESENT: See Sign-in Sheet

CALL TO ORDER: 6:09 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

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

OLD BUSINESS: N/A

NEW BUSINESS:

1. **[321 North Front Street, filed by Chris Dawson Architect](#), to reconstruct porches on the rear of the 2nd and 3rd floors with composite decking and metal baluster and rail system. Install exterior wooden slat walls on the eastern elevation of the new porches; a cantilevered awning extending above ground level; and small backlit signage for the rear of the building.**

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

1. If there are changes or alterations to the proposed design or materials the project must be reviewed by the Planning Bureau to determine its appropriateness.

The case was represented by Chris Dawson, 300 North 2nd Street, Suite 701, Harrisburg PA 17101 (aka “the Applicant”).

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
November 1, 2021**

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant if they had anything to add to the proposal. The Applicant stated that he thanks the City for approving the building permit with the condition that the exterior alterations are reviewed by HARB. The Applicant stated that last year there was an issue with parking for the additional units from the previous proposal for an addition. The Applicant stated that he is happy to answer any specific questions about the project and appreciates the help from the Planning Bureau. The Applicant stated that the alterations are compatible yet contemporary and have a minimal impact on the character of the neighborhood. The Applicant stated that his client's other projects have been successful and compatible with the character of the historic districts.

Mrs. Gribble asked if the proposed railings are metal. The Applicant stated that the proposed railings are metal since there are no records indicating the original design of the porches and the railing design. Mrs. Gribble stated the design appears to be simple yet appropriate and that the proposed canopy is contemporary yet compatible.

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

2. 1402 North 3rd Street, filed by SJL Rentals, to redesign the western elevation on Patrick Alley to accommodate new infill for additional interior floor space.

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

1. The historic signage on the façade shall be rehabilitated and preserved. Any alteration to the historic signage must be reviewed by the Planning Bureau and the HARB. If the HARB approves the removal of the signage, the sign should be donated or reused.
2. The historic wooden windows on the façade be repaired rather than replaced.
3. The exterior material for the proposed infill shall be compatible yet differentiated from the existing historic materials; such as wood or cementitious fiberboard lap siding.
4. The historic rear roofline shall be maintained and must not be altered to accommodate an alternative roof style.
5. The final design and materials will be submitted to the Planning Bureau for 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. The Applicant must submit material and product specifications prior to approval of building permit applications.
6. The Applicant must receive approvals from the Zoning Hearing Board and Planning Commission as necessary.

The case was represented by Sean Linder, 3396 Darien Road, Bethlehem, PA 18020 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicants if they had anything to add to the proposal. The Applicant stated that there is a lot of revitalization along the 3rd Street corridor and that this is one of the last

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
November 1, 2021**

properties on the block that need to be revitalized. The Applicant stated that he plans on doing minimal alterations to the primary façade including painting, repairing windows, and removing the false pent roof awning. The Applicant also stated that they either plan on using the existing signage for the commercial tenant or donate the sign to Sprocket Mural Works for a project.

The Applicant stated that the majority of the work is on the rear of the property which include the infill of the void where porches once existed, clad the exterior in cementitious fiberboard lap siding, install five new wood windows, and a six-panel wooden door.

Mrs. Gribble asked if the infill is within the same footprint and won't extend out over the alley. The Applicant stated that is correct and the infill will occupy the same footprint and be level with the building plane of the western façade. Mrs. Gribble asked if there is literature on the proposed windows. The Applicant stated that he plans on repairing the windows and if replacement is necessary then they would be replaced in-kind.

Mrs. Montgomery asked about the proposed windows for the rear of the building. The Applicant stated that those would be wood windows that would match the muntin pattern of the façade. Mrs. Gribble stated that she agrees and that would be the better direction.

Mrs. Gribble asked Mr. Grumbine to read the proposed conditions of approval. The Applicant stated that he is fine with the first condition. Mrs. Gribble stated that the second condition should be modified to include replacement of the windows if repair is not possible. The Applicant stated that he is fine with the third condition. The Applicant stated that he is fine with the fourth condition. Mr. Grumbine explained the need for the fifth condition to finalize products and aspects of the project as many were not included in the application. Mr. Gaylord stated that the condition should be modified to state that if the planning bureau rejects the final design then the applicant must submit a new application to HARB. The Applicant stated that he is fine with the sixth condition.

The Applicant had a question about the about the first condition. Mr. Grumbine explained that if the existing neon sign is retrofitted to have a different name or neon display then it would have to be reviewed by HARB.

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

3. 1718 North 2nd Street, filed by Harrisburg Redevelopment Group LLC, to construct a one-story rear addition to enclose a new chairlift and stairs clad with batten style fibercement siding and replacing siding on adjacent portion to match; refurbishing fire escape and remove part of the roof eave and dormer window to install door access from third floor; install an aluminum screening fence for condenser units; replace existing historic slate roof with asphalt shingles; and replace historic slate on dormer walls with fibercement siding.

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

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
November 1, 2021**

1. The existing historic slate on the roof and dormer walls shall be repaired or replaced in-kind and shall not be sheathed in incompatible materials.
2. The roof eave, cornice, corbels, and dormer on the northern elevation shall be preserved and shall not be altered to accommodate a new opening.
3. Any changes to the design or materials of the proposal must be reviewed by the Planning Bureau.

The case was represented by Kathryn Sterner, 1950 Market Street, Camp Hill PA 17011 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicants if they had anything to add to the proposal. The Applicant provided a brief summary of the project including the rear addition, roof materials, and alteration of the roof to install a new door for fire egress. The Applicant stated that the slate roof is in poor condition and that they are proposing to install an asphalt shingle roof.

Mrs. Gribble asked about the alteration of the roofline on the northern elevation for the installation of the egress door. The Applicant explained that the window from the dormer will be removed and the eave of the roof will be cut below the dormer to install the door to match the existing symmetry to the central façade tower. Mrs. Gribble asked Mr. Grumbine if this was the primary issue regarding the second proposed condition. Mr. Grumbine stated that is correct. Mrs. Gribble stated that she thinks it is a practical solution to the problem for the fire escape egress.

Mrs. Tennis asked what style of door is being proposed for the fire egress opening. The Applicant stated that they plan on using fire rated steel door with a small window. Ms. Tennis asked if the entire eave roofline below the dormer needs to be removed to install the door. The Applicant stated that they only need about three and a half feet of eave removal to install the door. Mrs. Gribble stated that she has an issue with the material of the proposed door and would prefer a wood door. Ms. Tennis stated that she would feel better if the least amount of roof material and eave is removed to install the door and feels that the symmetry is not necessary. The Applicant stated that she would not object to that option. Mr. Grumbine stated that the asymmetrical roofline under the dormer would be evidence in the future that it was altered and therefore could be corrected if needed. Mrs. Gribble asked about the proposed screening fence. The Applicant stated that the fence would screen the new condenser units under the fire escape.

Mrs. Gribble asked if the applicants have reviewed synthetic slate for the roof. The Applicants stated that they have reviewed synthetic slate and brought a sample of Boral synthetic slate. Mrs. Gribble stated that the City has lost so many historic slate roofs to asphalt. Mr. Grumbine stated that the same exact product was approved for use in the same neighborhood on North 2nd Street. The Applicant stated that the product has a lifetime warranty. Mrs. Montgomery stated that she is fine with approving the use of synthetic slate. Mrs. Gribble stated that the first condition should be amended to include the use of synthetic slate acceptable to the Planning Bureau. The Applicant asked about the use of synthetic slate on the side of the dormers as they are proposing to use fiber cement. Mrs. Gribble stated that she does not have a preference either way. Mr. Grumbine stated that the sides of dormers historically were sheathed in slate and it would be appropriate to install the synthetic slate on the dormers as well. The Board agrees that the synthetic slate should be installed on the sides of the dormers as well to match the historic slate.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
November 1, 2021**

Mrs. Montgomery asked about the final material and design for the proposed doors on the northern elevation. Mrs. Tennis stated that she does not have a preference on the material of the doors on the northern elevation. Mrs. Gribble stated that she thinks the doors should be wood. Mrs. Gribble asked to add another condition regarding the doors. Mr. Grumbine stated that the fourth condition can read that the new doors on the northern elevation shall be composed of wood material. Mr. Grumbine proposed that the Board allow Mr. Grumbine to finalize the proposed product of the door with the applicant prior to approval of permits. Mr. Gaylord recommended that the condition from the last case, regarding the submission of the final design to the Planning Bureau, to be included as a condition of approval for this case. The Board agreed.

Mr. Grumbine read the proposed conditions as amended.

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

OTHER BUSINESS: N/A

ADJOURNMENT: 7:31 PM

Ms. Tennis moved, and Ms. Rucker seconded the motion to adjourn. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (4-0) and the meeting adjourned at 7:31 PM.