

MINUTES

**HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
January 9, 2023
THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. CITY GOVERNMENT CENTER
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Trina Gribble, Chair
Kali Tennis, Vice Chair
Bruce Henry, Assistant Codes Administrator
April Rucker (arrived at 6:05 PM)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Camille Bennett

STAFF PRESENT: Geoffrey Knight, Planning Director
Neil Grover, City Solicitor

OTHERS PRESENT: See Sign-In Sheet

CALL TO ORDER: 6:03 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Henry moved, and Mrs. Tennis seconded the motion, to Approve the minutes from the November 7, 2022 meeting without corrections. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (3-0).

OLD BUSINESS: N/A

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. 133 & 135 Royal Terrace, filed by Kenneth Willm, to install a six-foot-high, wooden privacy fence enclosing the side yard of the property.**

The case was represented by Kenneth Willm (the property resident), 135 Royal Terrace, Harrisburg, PA 17103 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved with the following conditions:

1. The fence will be painted or stained upon installation.
2. The Applicant will not install a vehicular gate in the rear of the lot to ensure the property is not used to park vehicles, as noted in a complaint to the Codes Bureau in August 2022.

Mrs. Gribble asked Planning Bureau staff whether the property was located in an Architectural Conservation Overlay District (ACOD); Mr. Knight confirmed that it was. Mrs. Gribble asked whether there were any special considerations the Board should be aware of given that designation. Mr. Knight noted that an ACOD did not generally have the same level of scrutiny as projects in

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

municipal historic districts; he referenced a nearby fencing project on Linden Street in which the Board had granted the applicant some latitude in approving a chain-link fence design. He stated that it was really up to the Board on how strictly they wanted to apply the standards.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant whether they wanted to provide additional information on the proposal. The Applicant stated that the project was fairly straightforward and involved enclosing the adjacent property to his home with a six-foot-high fence. He noted that the building on other side of the lot was under construction and that waste sometimes blew into his yard; he also noted that nearby residents allowed their dogs to play in the yard, and that these issues created problems for his stepdaughter.

Mrs. Gribble asked Planning Bureau staff whether there were any zoning considerations involved in the review of the project. Mr. Knight confirmed that the proposed fence was in conformance with the applicable zoning regulations.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant whether the Planning Bureau's conditions were acceptable; he confirmed that they were. Mrs. Gribble recommended that the Applicant utilize 6x6 posts for the fence, as opposed to 4x4 posts, since they would provide more strength and durability.

Mrs. Tennis moved, and Mr. Henry seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (4-0).

2. 44 North Summit Street, filed by Heidi Dietz with Joyland Roofing, to replace existing slate shingles on the mansard roof and dormer with architectural laminate shingles.

The case was represented by Shanti Free (the property owner), 44 North Summit Street, Harrisburg, PA 17103 (aka "the Applicant").

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved with the following conditions:

1. If the Board authorizes the removal of the real slate shingles, the Applicant will utilize synthetic slate shingles that match the existing historic slate in reveal, color, size, and dimension.
2. If possible, slate shingles shall be saved or donated for use on other historic slate roofs for repair.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant whether they wanted to provide additional information on the proposal. The Applicant stated that she wasn't sure how the contracting company handled project waste and thus whether they would be able to save and retain any of the intact slate shingles. Mrs. Gribble noted that the photos provided by the Applicant did exhibit a compelling need to replace the roofing materials on the mansard and dormer roofs; she asked the Applicant if she had any comments or concerns about Condition #1 in the case report. The Applicant stated that she would have to contact the contractor to get a quote for the synthetic slate shingles, but that she was not opposed to using that product.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there were any questions or comments from the other Board members. Mrs. Tennis noted that the Applicant had included specifications for an asphalt shingle material

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

with their submission, and asked where the Applicant was intending on installing those. She stated that the shingles would be installed on the small awnings over the front and side entrances, which already had asphalt shingles, and that she wanted to provide an example of the color she was proposing on installing. The Applicant stated that she didn't believe the asphalt shingles were intended for the mansard and dormer roofs.

Ms. Rucker asked whether the cladding for the roofing materials on the upper floor and the awnings over the entrances would be the same color. The Applicant clarified that the upper roof was a flat rubber roof, and reiterated that the asphalt shingles were only intended for installation on the small awnings over the main entrances.

Mr. Henry moved, and Ms. Rucker seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (4-0).

The Applicant then noted that she was intending on having the siding on the home replaced and asked whether she would need to receive HARB approval; Mr. Knight stated that it would depend on the specifics of the project and that if the existing siding were vinyl or aluminum, she would have more latitude in the types of approvable materials.

3. 1504 Penn Street, filed by Daniel & Melody Witwer, to replace the existing one-over-one, double-hung windows on the first and second floors with aluminum-clad wooden windows.

The case was represented by Dan Witwer (the property owner), 314 East Glenn Road, Hershey, PA 17033; and Meg Connor with Studio 4 Showroom (the project contractor), 634 Lucknow Road, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka "the Applicants").

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved with the following conditions:

1. The Applicants must provide documentation from the manufacturer that the exterior material can be painted or stained without the voiding the warranty and without requiring special treatment.
2. The proposed windows must match exactly the dimensions of the sashes of the existing windows to ensure that the profile appearance is not changed.

Mrs. Gribble noted that the Applicants had brought window samples and asked if they wanted to provide more information on the project. The Applicants confirmed that they were intending on installing a wood frame window with an "extruded clad exterior." They stated that the product was an "insert" which would not impact the exterior window trim, but that they would have to confirm the dimensions of the windows.

The Applicants stated that they had some questions regarding Condition #1, as well as some supplemental documentation to provide to the Board. They stated that they were aware that the Board had approved Pella Endura-clad material in September 2022; she asked Planning Bureau staff to clarify the warranty and paintability of the product. Mr. Knight clarified that the Board's standard had been that a product must be paintable without voiding the warranty and without

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

requiring special treatment; he noted that the intention was to allow a property to evolve under a future owner. The Applicants stated that Marvin had an “approved method” to paint the extruded finish, but that it was a Kynar finish and required someone certified to apply Kynar treatments to ensure it adhered properly and did not void the warranty. She stated that the treatment was often used in saltwater environments.

The Applicants referenced material they had downloaded from Pella’s website which advised against painting any aluminum-clad wood products such as Endura-clad windows, as it may cause defects which might void the warranty. She stated that this language made the current material similar to the previously-approved Endura-clad product. The Applicants also stated that their product had a much more “historically accurate line” on the window profile.

Mrs. Gribble stated that she felt it was worth spending some time to consider alternative products; she noted that even newer wood windows did not have the same qualities as old growth lumber. She did note that the Guidelines recommended that repair of existing windows be considered before replacement; she noted that the existing windows appeared to be original and thus should be repaired or replaced in-kind. Mrs. Gribble agreed with Planning Bureau staff that they needed to consider the evolution of the property under future owners, but also noted that the Board should ensure the integrity and longevity of the overall structures as well.

Mrs. Gribble noted that the Board had reviewed various composite materials for windows in the past.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether Fibrex was paintable, and Mr. Knight stated that documentation from Andersen had confirmed that it was. He noted that previous Boards had approached the use of that product carefully, approving proposals on an individual basis until such time as enough had been approved and installed that the Planning Bureau could confirm how the product responded to conditions. He noted that after a few years, the Board recognized that they were approving the product consistently, that it was within the standards they had upheld, and that it was weathering appropriately, to the point they felt comfortable authorizing the Planning Bureau to administrative approve its use.

Mrs. Gribble outlined some of the product aspects that the Board reviewed in their consideration of alternative materials, noted the differentiations in how elements of different products and materials fit together, and that different sash widths and profiles that affected the appearance of the windows. The Applicants stated that they had a sample window that the Board could review for their consideration of the current proposal; Mrs. Gribble stated that she felt it would be helpful to review that product.

The Applicants displayed the window section they had brought to the meeting; Mrs. Tennis asked whether the proposed windows would utilize the same beige color as the sample; the Applicants stated that they had not confirmed the color. Mrs. Tennis asked about the longevity of the product; the Applicants stated that it had a twenty-year warranty.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

Mrs. Tennis asked whether it was an appropriate time to have a larger discussion on alternative window products; Mrs. Gribble suggested that the discussion should be limited to the current application.

Mrs. Tennis requested confirmation on which windows were being replaced; the Applicants confirmed that the project involved replacement of the three windows on the front façade. She stated that the size of the first-floor window established another factor in the Board's consideration of window options. Mrs. Tennis stated that the project would result in the removal of the storm windows, which she considered to be a factor in the Applicant's favor, and that the proposed windows would have energy-efficient glass. She stated that she had no objections to the proposal.

Mrs. Gribble asked if there were any concerns about the paintability of the product. Ms. Rucker confirmed that the Board had always maintained the standard that alternative products be paintable. The Applicants reiterated that there was a twenty-year warranty on the finish of the extruded exterior material, and stated that it was longer than a wood window product. Ms. Rucker noted that the Applicants had stated that the window was not paintable without voiding the warranty. The Applicants stated that the Marvin window product was paintable, but required specialized craftsman and materials so that the warranty was not voided.

Ms. Rucker asked for details on the painting process. The Applicants reiterated that it was not something that a homeowner could do themselves, and the contractor (Ms. Connor) noted that she was representing the contractor and not the manufacturer, and thus could not provide specifics on the required treatment, but noted that the required "painting" material was Kynar and was made by Valspar. The Applicants stated that the manufacturer did not provide specifics on the required treatment process because it was not for public consumption.

Ms. Rucker noted that the product required a specific treatment or else the warranty would be voided. The Applicants claimed that consideration applied to all window materials, even wood and fiberglass windows; and thus, the proposed windows were "officially paintable." They stated that then if the standard was that a property owner could paint the window themselves without voiding the warranty, then neither the currently-proposed Marvin windows nor the previously-approved Pella windows would conform to that standard. The Applicants reiterated that the proposed window required specific treatments with specific products. Mrs. Gribble stated that she was familiar with Kynar and noted that it did not fade.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicants to provide more information on the warranty of other window products; they stated that Marvin's wood windows only had a ten-year warranty, and noted they were not finished and were only installed either "bare" or primed. They stated that there were generally no warranties on wooden windows in their industry because they were exposed to the elements, although they acknowledged that they weren't aware of what sort of warranty Andersen Fibrex windows might have; they also objected to the stated requirement for that product, noting that it was a proprietary name and suggested the Board use the term "wood composite." Mr. Knight stated that the Planning Bureau always used that terminology when discussing options with the public, since there were other products that would qualify under that definition, although he did note that some manufacturers claimed their products were "wood composite" when they were not. He noted that the Board had previously approved similar windows from other manufacturers.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

Ms. Rucker asked the Applicants whether Marvin made windows in a wood composite material. The Applicants gave a general overview of the term “wood composite” and the composition of the material, and stated that their product was a “full fiberglass” composite involving fiberglass mesh in a vinyl polymer binding agent; they eventually confirmed there was no wood in their product. They compared the proposed windows to Fibrex windows, and stated that Fibrex windows were only three times stronger than vinyl whereas the proposed material was eight times stronger. They stated that the proposed window product did not expand and contract like wooden windows. The Applicants stated that the exterior of the Marvin windows could be scratched and sanded in a similar manner to Fibrex, in preparation for painting.

Mrs. Gribble stated that she didn’t know whether the Board wanted to consider the use of the proposed material.

The Applicants discussed the product in more detail and stated that it was wood-framed with an extruded fiberglass exterior.

Mrs. Gribble stated that the sample provided by the Applicant had a “plastic” texture; the Applicants confirmed that there was no plastic in the material. Mrs. Gribble and Mrs. Tennis both inspected the sample. Mrs. Gribble stated that it had a matte finish, but that it was evident upon visual inspection that the material was not wood. She stated that the Board should consider the issues of paintability and warranties.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the window casing material shown in the sample provided by the Applicants was included in the unit, and how that would be installed in the window opening. They noted that Mr. Witwer would be installing the windows himself. They provided an overview of how the proposed product would generally fit into the window opening; they noted that they would only be removing the existing sashes and then installing the window packet in the existing frame. The Applicants stated that expanding foam was generally sprayed into the pocket spaces between the window packet and the frame for insulation and energy-efficiency purposes; they stated that the product could also be ordered in a “full-frame” packet in which all the existing wooden elements within the window opening would be replaced with extruded, aluminum-clad elements.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the existing wooden frames would be maintained, and that just the sashes and jambs would be replaced; the Applicants confirmed that was correct. Mrs. Tennis asked whether the wooden frames would be painted to match the exterior color of the windows; the Applicants confirmed that was correct, but clarified that the packet would be installed into the window frame.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the existing window sills were clad; the Applicants stated that they appeared to be clad in an older tin material, and that they intended to retain the existing sills and headers.

Mrs. Gribble outlined the conditions in the Planning Bureau’s case report. She noted that the Applicants were proposing to use a material that required a specialized Kynar painting treatment, which conflicted with Condition #1. Ms. Rucker asked whether they had documentation regarding the warranty; the Applicants confirmed that they had an older hard copy but could also transmit a

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

digital copy of the updated warranty as well. Mrs. Gribble asked whether the project would exactly match the profiles of the existing windows; the Applicants stated that they would have to measure the window opening and the existing sash dimensions to confirm that. They asked Planning Bureau staff whether there was any tolerance on the issue of the window profiles. Mr. Knight stated that it would ultimately be up to the Board, but that the general concern was to retain the existing appearance of the windows especially for attached rowhomes with fenestration that mirrored nearby buildings.

Mrs. Gribble asked Mr. Henry if had any questions or concerns about the conditions; he had none.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether any of the Board members wanted to make a motion to approve the request with conditions noted in the Planning Bureau's case report. Mrs. Tennis moved, and Mr. Henry seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff Conditions. The motion resulted in a split vote (2-1-1; with Mrs. Gribble abstaining because she had recused herself due to a potential conflict of interest). Mrs. Tennis asked whether the vote had passed; Mr. Grover stated that he believed the vote had not passed, because a majority of the Board members had not voted in favor of the motion.

Mr. Grover stated that if Mrs. Gribble had abstained due to a perceiving conflict of interest, that under the rules governing municipal boards, if a decision could not be made without the recused member's vote, that individual had the option of voting on the motion. He stated that without her vote one way or the other, the motion had failed.

Mrs. Gribble asked legal counsel how the Board should approach the situation. Mr. Grover noted that Mrs. Gribble would have to state the reason for her recusal, and then the Board could take another vote.

Mrs. Gribble noted that she was recusing herself because she had a personal relationship with one of the Applicants, Mrs. Connor; she stated that she had mixed feelings about voting on the proposal based on previous discussions the Board had regarding conflicts of interest. Mr. Grover stated that the Board would have to make a motion to rescind the prior vote, and afterwards could make another motion to Table the review until the following month's meeting if they felt that a different decision might be possible in the future. Mrs. Tennis asked if they had the option to hear the case again when all the members were present; Mr. Grover noted that a fifth member may establish a more definitive vote. He stated that the Applicant would have to agree to that process, noting that they could accept the Board's denial of the proposal and then appeal that decision to City Council.

The Applicants stated that they were willing to consider being allowed to install fiberglass windows as an alternative to the proposed windows, although they noted that they were unsure of whether the large first-floor window could be constructed of that material.

Mr. Grover reiterated that the Board could make a motion to reconsider and withdraw the prior motion. Mrs. Gribble asked whether the Board needed to take a new vote at the current meeting; Mr. Grover noted that the Applicants appeared to be acceptable to a continuance of the case so that they could gather more information on alternative options. The Applicants concurred.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

Mr. Henry moved, and Ms. Rucker seconded the motion, to Rescind the prior motion. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (4-0; Mrs. Gribble again recused herself). Mr. Grover noted that the issue was now effectively “back to square one,” and a new motion could proceed. The Applicant asked whether they needed to submit a new application; Mr. Knight confirmed that they would not, and that they would have to attend the next meeting of the Board and would be the first case heard under “Old Business.”

Ms. Rucker moved, and Mrs. Tennis seconded the motion, to Table the application. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (4-0; Mrs. Gribble again recused herself).

Ms. Connor (the contractor) stated that both her company and Marvin (the window manufacturer) were willing to present to the Board regarding window products or installation procedures.

4. 931 Grand Street, filed by James Greene, to replace the front door with a metal door and full-view storm door, and to replace two, six-over-six windows on the third floor of the property.

The case was represented by James Greene (the property owner), 931 Grand Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102; and Chris Lauver with Grand Opening Windows & Doors (the contractor), 931 East Main Street, New Kingston, PA 17072 (aka “the Applicants”).

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Denied.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant whether he wanted to provide additional information on the proposal. The Applicants stated that the current door was relatively old and was out of alignment, resulting in gaps around the door creating drafts and safety concerns. They stated that the third-floor windows were also old and that they were not sure when they were last replaced, but that replacing them would improve the appearance and energy-efficiency of the property.

The Applicants stated that some of the properties on the street were having doors replaced that were similar to the one proposed for the subject property and thus he was unsure as to why his door would not also be approved. Mr. Knight stated that the Planning Bureau would not have approved the installation of similar metal doors, and that if they were installed, that was done illegally.

Mr. Henry asked whether the subject property had been damaged by a recent fire on the block; the Applicants confirmed that it had only reached the adjacent property and had not damaged the subject property.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the Applicants had looked at all the six-over-six windows on the property and the street, noting that the proposal involved replacement with four-over-four windows; they confirmed that they would only be replacing the dormer windows on the front and back and that they were not proposing to replace any other windows at this time. The Applicants confirmed that six-over-six divided lite grills could be installed between the glass panes, they noted that the manufacturer usually included grid sizes in the product specifications that “appeared to be right.”

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

Ms. Rucker inquired as to why the property owner had chosen a steel door with the fan light pane; he stated that he picked that option from amongst the alternatives provided for his review because he thought it looked nice. The Applicants stated that much of the wood elements, such as the windows and door, were weathering poorly and not holding up against the conditions.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Board members whether they wanted to discuss the paintability of the materials. Mr. Lauver stated that he owned his company, and confirmed that when the project estimator had worked with the property owner, he failed to confirm that it was in an historic district and that while his company did a lot of work in the area, they usually did not do work in historic districts. The Applicants stated that there were lots of steel storm doors and lots of vinyl windows on the block, and stated that the dormer windows were not visible from the street.

Mr. Lauver admitted that his firm had made an incorrect assumption, but stated that the Board shouldn't assume that vinyl windows were cheap and inappropriate for historic districts. He stated that the embossed, raised-panel door was better than cheaper fiberglass doors. He stated that the street featured steel, fiberglass, and aluminum storm doors, and some vinyl windows.

Mr. Knight noted that full-view storm doors were not reviewable by HARB, per the Historic District Design Guidelines.

The Applicants stated that the vinyl window material could be painted with acrylic paint, and that the steel door could also be painted, although they confirmed that it would be pre-finished and would not be painted.

Mrs. Gribble stated that she was not aware of any historic precedent for the style of door being proposed. Mrs. Tennis stated that she didn't feel the style of door was appropriate and felt that steel doors had a "commercial feel" that she didn't feel was appropriate for residential buildings. She also stated that steel doors could be permanently dented, and that she was worried about how that would look over time; the Applicants stated that the metal in the proposed door would be twice as thick as regular doors. Mrs. Tennis reiterated her concern that even a high-quality steel door would not age well.

Mrs. Gribble noted that it sounded as though it was possible to change the grill pattern within the window glass, which might address one of the Planning Bureau's concerns. The Applicants confirmed that the grill pattern could be changed and stated that they could also change the half-round pane in the door. Mrs. Gribble stated that she didn't feel the proposed door pane had precedent for the age of the property or within the context of the block; the Applicants confirmed that that there were no similar doors on the street. Mrs. Gribble expressed concerns that the door would not be appropriate for the age and appearance of the property.

The Applicant asked whether those concerns would be applicable to his replacing the wood lap siding with Hardie board. Mrs. Gribble noted that cementitious fiberboard should be installed in the same style and dimensional configuration as the existing wood lap siding.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

The Applicants asked whether the proposed storm door was appropriate. Mr. Knight confirmed that storm doors were not regulated by the Historic District Design Guidelines. The Applicants confirmed that they could replace the proposed door with a six-panel fiberglass door. Mrs. Gribble stated that she would want to review the proposed door design. Mrs. Tennis stated that she felt the proposal would be a good compromise, so long as the transom was retained. The Applicants stated that many of the other properties on the street featured six-paneled doors.

Mrs. Gribble stated that it would be helpful to have photos of the other properties on the street to better understand the context of the property. Mr. Knight confirmed that he had conducted a site visit to the property and was surprised by how many of the original six-over-six windows remained in other properties on the block. He stated that the continuity and integrity of the architectural elements was similar to a project that the Board had recently reviewed regarding the replacement of a standing seam metal roof with asphalt shingles; he noted that in that case, as in the current one, the integrity of the features in other buildings on the block created a continuity that gave extra weight to the consideration of replacing those features.

The Applicants asked whether the homes on the street were always expected to have the same appearance and whether they could ever be upgraded by their owners. Ms. Rucker noted that the City maintained regulations that required owners of property in historic districts to retain the appearance and materials of the historic exterior elements as much as possible. Mr. Knight noted that the integrity of historic buildings and districts was important because once that was lost, it could never be recovered or rebuilt, and thus it was critical to ensure that structures retained their historic materials and appearance as long as possible. He also noted that the historic district regulations had a legal basis, as they were included in the Zoning Code.

The Applicant asked if all of the homes on Grand Street were historic; Mr. Knight confirmed that was the case. Ms. Rucker asked how long Mr. Greene had lived at the property; he stated that he had only lived at the home for approximately two and a half years. Ms. Rucker asked whether he had been informed that he was in an historic district; Mr. Greene confirmed that he was apprised of that designation when he had previously had the roof replaced. The Applicants asked whether new property owners were informed that they were in an historic district when they purchased a home; Ms. Rucker confirmed that was the case, and noted that realtors were supposed to inform their clients if a home was in an historic district. Mr. Henry confirmed that property owners received a Buyer's Notification with that information.

The Applicant stated that his neighbor had vinyl-sided dormer cheeks, which he had wanted to install, but he was required to use Hardie board instead. He asked why some properties were permitted to use certain materials, and other properties were not, if all of the homes were historic. Mr. Knight noted that most of the historic districts were established in the 1980s and 1990s, and that certain non-historic products such as vinyl siding may have been installed before that, which created a non-conforming element that could be replaced in-kind going forward just for those properties. He noted that contractors often did unpermitted work during nights and weekends, but the Applicants stated that was not the case. Mr. Knight requested the property address and noted that he could check his records to see if that work had been approved; the Applicant stated that it was located on the opposite side of the street.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

The contractor stated that he had recently received a request for work at 1935 North 3rd Street, and that the property stated incorrectly that they were not in an historic district; he noted that he followed up with Mr. Knight to ask if that was correct, and he had confirmed that the property was located in an historic district.

Mrs. Gribble asked what action the Board wanted to take on the current proposal. Ms. Rucker suggested they vote to Table the application to allow the Applicants to bring additional materials back before the Board.

The Applicants inquired as to what other options they had to replace the front door; Mrs. Gribble noted that a wooden door could be administratively approved, and Mrs. Tennis asked whether there was a precedent that would allow use of a fiberglass door. Mr. Knight stated that he couldn't recall a similar recent proposal, but that he believed the Board had approved use of that product in the past. The Applicants confirmed that the steel door could be replaced with a fiberglass option. Mr. Grover stated that the Applicants should bring documentation for revised alternatives to the next meeting for the Board's review.

Ms. Rucker moved, and Mr. Henry seconded the motion, to Table the application until the February HARB meeting. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (4-0).

5. 1933 North 2nd Street, filed by Carlos Dickey, to replace the former wooden entrance door with a composite door, and to replace tongue-in-groove boards and trim with pressure-treated wood. This is an After-the-Fact application. The project will also replace the elevated rear deck with fencing with a ground-level deck with six-foot-high, vinyl fencing, which is an in-kind replacement.

The case was represented by Carlos Dickey (the property owner), 1933 North 2nd Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102 (aka "the Applicant").

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant will install fence of an historically-appropriate material and will not utilize the proposed vinyl product.
2. The Planning Bureau recommends that the Applicant utilize a better wood product for the porch floorboards, as pressure-treated lumber can warp and split, or even to consider an administratively-approvable alternate material such as Trex or AZEK in a tongue-in-groove design.
3. The Applicant shall provide confirmation from the manufacturer that the door can be painted without voiding the warranty and without requiring special treatment.
4. The Applicant must submit a complete Floodplain Development Application, with all accompanying, required documentation, for the proposed rear yard fence.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant whether he understood the conditions and they were acceptable. The Applicant asked whether he had to use tongue-in-groove flooring instead of pressure-treated wood; Mr. Knight confirmed that pressure-treated wood would not be permitted as replacement deck flooring and noted that that product usually resulted in more warping compared to other types

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

of wood. Mr. Knight also noted that both AZEK and Trex were administratively-approved alternate materials; Ms. Rucker confirmed that the Board would approve those. The Applicant stated that he was considering that option, but didn't know that it was acceptable.

The Applicant stated that the rear deck would be comprised of a composite material, but asked whether he would be permitted to install a vinyl fence. Mr. Knight noted that he had reviewed the City records to find evidence of the installation of the vinyl fence being approved, but that he could find no such documentation; he stated that the fence appeared to be relatively new. The Applicant stated that a contractor he hired had installed the fence shortly after he purchased the building approximately 22 years ago, and that he wasn't sure whether the contractor submitted a permit for the work. Ms. Rucker asked whether there had been a Board in effect at that time; Mr. Knight confirmed that there had been an active Board at the time.

Mr. Knight stated that a decision on the fence was ultimately up to the Board members. The Applicant noted that he would be removing the fence to install a new fence regardless of the determination; Mr. Knight noted that it thus made it an opportune time to correct the existing historic district violation, but reiterated that it was ultimately up to the Board to determine whether a vinyl fence could be re-installed as an in-kind replacement. The Applicant stated that he wanted to have a low-maintenance option as he was getting older and didn't want to do a lot of work to maintain it.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the Condition #2 was acceptable to the Applicant, and he confirmed that it was. Mrs. Gribble asked whether Condition #1 was acceptable; the Applicant reiterated that he did not want to use a wood product because it would require regular painting or staining, and asked whether a composite fence material was permitted. Ms. Rucker stated that whatever material was used would need to be paintable, similar to the requirement for doors and windows. Mr. Knight stated that so long as a paintable composite material was available for fences, he would consider that to be acceptable. Mrs. Gribble confirmed that fences were available in the AZEK material; Mr. Knight confirmed that he would consider that to be appropriate. Ms. Rucker noted that it would be more durable than vinyl fencing.

Ms. Rucker asked whether a fence in the rear yard was visible from the street; Mr. Knight noted that the fence was minimally-visible from the front of the property along 2nd Street, but was more visible from the side along Peffer Street because it was constructed atop the elevated deck. The Applicant confirmed that the new deck would be at ground level.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the Applicant had submitted any documentation regarding the paintability of the product proposed for the front door, as outlined in Condition #3; Mr. Knight stated that he had not received any such documentation. He stated that the proposed product was a fiberglass door and that the manufacturer should have some documentation regarding the paintability of the surface; the Applicant stated that it was a composite door and he was pretty sure it could be painted. Mr. Knight suggested the Applicant research the manufacturer's website to see whether they had documentation regarding the product specifications.

Mrs. Gribble noted that Condition #4 was a requirement outside of the Board's purview, but wanted to remind the Applicant that the rear fence required a floodplain review. The Applicant

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

stated that he had provided that documentation; Mr. Knight clarified that he had only submitted the application documentation, and had not provided any of the additional documentation required for that review.

The Applicant stated that the front porch was beginning to collapse and the deck boards were already rotting out.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there were any other questions or concerns from the Board members about the conditions in the case report; there were none.

Ms. Rucker moved, and Mr. Henry seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (4-0). The Applicant requested confirmation that he had to use a composite fence and TREX tongue-in-groove floor boards for the front porch. Mr. Knight stated that the Applicant would be receiving a resolution with the conditions in the case report and the discussion at the meeting.

6. 1501 North Front Street, filed by Joseph Turnowchyk with Hex9 Architects, to undertake a comprehensive redesign of the existing building including interior alterations, minor expansions of the building footprint, the addition of a second floor, and multiple façade treatments.

The case was represented by John Odorisio with PIADA (the property owner), 1501 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102; Caitlin Siegrist and Joe Turnowchyk with Hex 9 Architects (the project architects), 620 East Oregon Road, Lititz, PA 17543 (aka “the Applicants”).

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant should consider utilizing a less fragmented and more unified façade treatment, particularly in locations on the side and rear elevations which propose the addition of small sections of wood cladding. The Planning Bureau would recommend utilizing no more than three primary façade treatments.
2. Any new signage will have to be in conformance with the zoning regulations for signage in the Riverfront (RF) district; the Planning Bureau notes that the renderings show more sign and larger signage than permitted per Section 7-325.6 of the Zoning Code.

The Applicants asked the Planning Bureau staff to re-read the conditions, specifically with respect to the materiality. Mr. Knight noted that the design proposed included a couple sections of faux-wood cladding that did not mesh with the design of the rest of the building, although he noted that it might be a subjective issue for the Board. He noted that the building had no historic value, and that the project could thus be treated as new construction, and that because of that, there should be more of a focus on visual cohesion.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicants to provide a presentation on the overall project, with a focus on the exterior elements.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

The Applicants noted that the project involved an expansion of the existing facility to accommodate more programming; they set up a presentation board and referenced the plan set in the Board members' packets. Mrs. Gribble stated that the Applicants could begin with a description of the interior changes, and how they related to the exterior changes.

The Applicants noted that the surrounding neighborhood featured a variety of different building types and architectural styles, with some patterns in appearance and use changing block by block. They noted that it informed the "transitional" style of their proposal. They noted that the existing building featured a low ceiling height, which meant that the second-story addition could not be too tall or else it would look unbalanced, and that it meant they needed to use façade elements to help the addition "raise" the height of the first floor.

The Applicants noted some of the interior spaces and structural elements that helped dictate where and how some of the proposed walls and spaces had to be built and that, from the outside, as someone travel around the building, the change in materials would reflect the differentiation in the neighborhood. The Applicants stated that the proposed cornice would use the same awning that currently ran around the building, but that different materials would be used on different façades to define different spaces. They reiterated that the proposal was to create a unique image for the building, but one that also related to the neighborhood.

The Applicants described some of the buildings in the surrounding neighborhood, including the residential rowhomes to the south, and the transition between uses on different blocks, including commercial spaces to the north and east. They described some of the architectural elements of the surrounding buildings and how they tried to integrate them into the proposed design. They highlighted that they didn't want the building to appear to be a "top heavy" box, and that the property owner did not require the additional space, so they did not have the second floor occupy the entire footprint of the first floor.

The Applicants stated that they wanted the building to address the river, which resulted in large glass windows along the western elevation to highlight the views of the river, but also to have the building addressed from the river, which resulted in an approach that had a "broken-up" façade. They stated that they wanted details in the façade to reflect the variety of architectural details in surrounding buildings, including soldiering course mortar, thin stone bands around the building, and windows wrapped with trim. The Applicants stated that the existing brick façade would be removed, as it had begun to deteriorate, and four-inch-thick brick and stone veneers would be installed.

The Applicants addressed the condition in the Planning Bureau's case report, and stated that they used wood infill between the windows so that they did not appear as individual gaps in the façade. They reiterated that the differentiation of the façade elements was intended to visually break up the building and distract from the low first floor of the existing structure.

Mrs. Gribble acknowledged that the existing building presented challenges in its rehabilitation, and stated that she appreciated the Applicants' efforts to redesign the building amidst a variety of different architectural styles and uses. She asked the other Board members if they had comments on the proposal and how it integrated into the surrounding neighborhood.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

Mrs. Tennis stated that she was very familiar with the building since she lived nearby. She asked whether the footprint of the proposed building was the same as the existing building; the Applicants confirmed that there would be a small expansion near the entrance, which would include some small spaces like closets and a bathroom, but that otherwise there would be no physical expansion of the building. Mrs. Tennis asked whether the use was changing, and the Applicants responded that it was not.

Mrs. Tennis noted that she counted seven different façade materials and asked how many there were overall. The Applicants referenced the plan sets and stated that there were four major façade elements, including two types of masonry and two types of metal cladding. They noted that there were some different materials involved in other elements such as the cornice and window trim. The Applicants noted that the rear of the second floor included a small screening area to conceal the HVAC equipment. They stated that while there were different materials, they wanted to retain a consistent “tonal value” and that some of the façade treatments were designed to provide a variety of textures to the building.

Mrs. Gribble noted that while the building itself could technically qualify as an historic structure, it did not provide any historic or architectural value and was not a contributory structure; however, she noted that the historic Mira Lloyd Dock residence was located directly across the street. She asked the Applicants to describe how the proposed metal siding was supposed to reflect the brick residential structures on the other side of Reily Street. The Applicants stated that they focused on the painted wooden porches, bay windows, and cornices on those structures, which stood out from the principal brick masonry façade. Ms. Rucker stated that she didn’t think the proposed façade elements reflected the wooden elements of the adjacent residences that the Applicants had referenced.

Mrs. Tennis asked about the removal of the existing brick façade; the Applicants confirmed that the current brick veneer had substantial damage behind it due to the accumulation of moisture over the years. Ms. Rucker asked whether the entire façade would be replaced; the Applicants confirmed that it would be replaced with a couple different masonry products.

Mrs. Tennis noted that the front elevation featured commercial storefront windows. She asked whether the Applicant would be amenable to reducing the number of materials on the building; they stated that they would, and noted that they had provided preliminary renderings to Planning Bureau staff, who had recommended the use of more masonry and less horizontal siding elements. They also noted that Planning Bureau staff had noted the presence of the windows on the southern elevation, and that they proposed the faux-wood metal panels to tie them together into a single block, but that they did have design options without that feature.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the older windows had to remain where they were; the Applicants confirmed that was the case because the existing window openings had to stay the same size, and noted that the larger windows on the western elevation would be incorporated into the newer elements of the design.

Ms. Rucker inquired as to how long the project would take to complete; the Applicants stated that it would take three to four months to finalize the design, and an additional eight months to build,

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

and noted that there would likely be some additional contingency time for things like permitting. They noted that they had engaged with the Planning Bureau on their due diligence with background issues such as parking and floodplain considerations.

The Applicants returned to a discussion of the structural issues, noting that they had done a complete evaluation of the building and noted some changes they would be make regarding the bridging of structural walls. They noted that the building had originally been a doctor's office, and that some of the spaces had been designed to accommodate features unique to that use such as a large X-ray machine.

Mrs. Gribble stated that she preferred to review the project as new construction, and noted that the Historic District Design Guidelines recommended the design be referential to the neighborhood and responsive to the surroundings. Mrs. Tennis stated that it was a unique building and thus a unique opportunity for the Board, noting that all the elevations were visible from a public right-of-way. She stated that it was an opportunity to have the building really make a statement, and that she felt the design of the front elevation would be more successful if it utilized a single material. She stated that she didn't think the design succeeded in replicating the appearance of attached rowhomes. Mrs. Tennis also stated that while she appreciated the intention to hide the height of the existing building with façade treatments, but that she felt less materials would create a better overall project and help it blend into the neighborhood.

The Applicants confirmed that the proposed masonry veneer panels were approximately one foot by two feet called "thinstone," and that it was not structural. They stated that they could possibly change the patterning of the material, but noted that it needed larger spaces given its sized and that you wouldn't want to incorporate it into some of the smaller façade sections. They noted that they could incorporate a small block size with a different texture in the same general color, in order to break up the color differentiation. The Applicants stated that they could generate a new rendering for the Board.

Mrs. Gribble concurred with Mrs. Tennis' comments, and agreed that the project would be more successful with fewer materials. She noted that while it was a small property, it was a high-profile property and the design would set a precedent for similar structures.

Mrs. Tennis noted the design references from the surrounding neighborhood that were in the submission packet, and stated that even the commercial buildings along Front Street were often tied into the residential buildings along 2nd Street and some of the cross streets. The Applicants agreed and noted that they could utilize elements like differentiated brick coursing.

Mrs. Tennis also noted that horizontal awning windows on the second-floor expansion; the Applicants confirmed that those were incorporated into the façade because that space would be designed as a catering kitchen, which required higher windows. They also noted that there a training and conference room would be located on the second floor, which would be topped with a sloped roof that could potentially accommodate sustainable elements like solar panels in the future, and that this configuration also created space for clerestory windows. They noted that the design would allow larger windows for river reviews.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

Mrs. Tennis stated that she felt the combination of the storefront windows on the front elevation and the more residential-sized windows on the other elevations created a mismatched fenestration pattern. The Applicants reiterated that they wanted to retain the residential scale windows along Reily Street, as that elevation faced rowhomes across the street, while creating river views with the larger windows along Front Street. They noted that the property owner expected to host government officials on-site and reiterated that they would be holding conferences and training sessions in the second-floor addition, and thus the interior space needed to be designed to meet the needs of that use, including a reduction in glare within the room.

Mrs. Gribble noted that if the Applicants were concerned about the impacts of glare on the use of the interior space, the large storefront windows on the southwestern façade would create a larger issue given the position of the sun during warmer months. She also concurred with Mrs. Tennis regarding the mismatch of the windows and noted that as a former resident of the neighborhood, she wasn't aware of many larger windows in the surrounding community.

The Applicants stated that they could review their approach to windows on the western elevation, since they had more control over that design than of the existing window openings; they noted a couple alternatives, including awnings and vertical slats within the windows. Mrs. Gribble stated that the project should take advantage of the river views, which was one of the city's advantages, but also reminded the Applicants that this was a highly-visible and high-profile site along Front Street. She noted that tying the modern building into the surrounding historic neighborhood within the context of commercial and residential buildings would be a challenge.

Mrs. Gribble stated that she wasn't aware of a nearby precedent for this type of project, although there had been some alterations to existing commercial structures along Front Street. Mr. Knight noted that the WebFX building on the 1700 block of North Front Street had several modern alterations in the past decade. Mrs. Gribble noted that it was converted from a residence and still featured many of the characteristics of that use. Mr. Knight noted that he had considered that site when developing the recommendations for the current project, specifically with respect to the color and design of the façade treatments.

Mr. Knight stated that the majority of the historic character in the surrounding neighborhood came from residential uses and not the commercial uses, referencing the modern commercial buildings to the north and east of the site, and that these properties would not really contributor to the district. Mrs. Gribble concurred and stated that trying to make the subject property look like rowhomes wasn't the right approach to the project. She stated that trying to make a commercial building look like residential buildings created confusion. She stated that the Board's responsibility was to ensure the building better tied into the neighborhood. Mrs. Gribble asked whether the project timeline could accommodate a continuance of the case so that new designs could be presented. The Applicants stated that they would be able to do that.

Mr. Henry stated that he felt the design looked "too busy" and that he didn't feel that it should be designed to look like two different residential structures.

Mrs. Tennis asked for some clarity on Condition #2, which referenced signage conformance with the Zoning Code; she noted that there was existing signage on the property, but didn't know

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

whether the condition referred to that element or to the new wall signage shown on the renderings. Mr. Knight confirmed that the renderings showed two wall signs but that the zoning regulations for the Riverfront district only permitted one wall sign by right. The Applicants stated that they had reviewed the zoning regulations and confirmed that new signage could be the same size as older signage, but had not realized that only one wall sign was permitted.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the Board should vote to Table the application; Mrs. Gribble stated that she didn't know what the alternative would be since there didn't seem to be support for approving the current design with conditions without having clarity on a final design. She asked whether that was acceptable to the Applicants; they confirmed that it was and noted that it would likely result in a better overall project.

Ms. Rucker moved, and Mrs. Tennis seconded the motion, to Table the application. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (4-0).

OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Discussion of HARB by-laws

Mr. Knight noted that the Board had been considering changes to the HARB by-laws, including revisions to the residency requirements; he noted that the Law Bureau had some reservations about the changes because City Council had the ultimate approval authority to change the legislation necessary to allow the Board's revisions. He stated that Mr. Grover might have some additional comments regarding some of the changes that the Board had been considering.

Mr. Grover noted that Mr. Ekema-Agbaw had not been aware of some of the local laws regulating changes that a Board could make to their by-laws, and that some of the proposed changes appeared to be outside of the Board's purview and authority. He noted that the Board was not an appointing authority and could not set the conditions of its membership, although they could vote to make recommendations to City Council to make changes. He stated that the aspects of the by-laws that the Board could address were operational issues related to board meetings.

Mr. Grover noted that the City ordinance regulating the Board established a quasi-professional board with three professional positions – an architect, a realtor, and a Codes official – and that the remainder of the seats were to be held by members of the public with a general interest in historic preservation. He noted that the Board was advisory to City Council, and their role was to make recommendations to that body for their consideration, although he noted that they generally followed the Board's resolution.

Mr. Grover noted that he hadn't been able to fully consider the discussion of the changes at previous months' meetings, although he noted that as the City Solicitor, he would have ultimately had final review before the legislation went to City Council. He stated that he wasn't quite sure what the Board was trying to accomplish in the updates. Mrs. Gribble stated that the by-laws did not quite cover aspects of membership that the Board wanted to address. Mr. Knight noted that the existing by-laws had been adopted in 2010, and that some aspects did not quite align with the regulations in the Zoning Code, which was adopted in 2014. He noted that the Board wanted to require residency within an historic district to ensure that members had a vested interest in the effective and fair application of the guidelines. Mr. Grover stated that that authority was only held

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

by the City's elected officials. He stated that the current ordinance stated that board members should have a vested interest or experience in the field.

Mr. Grover recommended that the Board not impose conditions that would narrow the potential candidate pool, observing that there were already two vacant seats on the Board.

Mrs. Tennis noted that the by-laws already included a residency requirement; Mr. Grover stated that he would have to thoroughly review the by-laws to understand the current language and better discern whether proposed changes could be undertaken by the Board. Mr. Knight noted that some of the discussion was less focused on a residency requirement and more on whether that residency was defined as being in a national or eligible historic district.

Mr. Knight noted that another major point of discussion was conflicts of interest, noting that the State had its own conflicts, and stated that he was unsure of whether those existing regulations would supersede whatever recommendations the Board was proposing. Mr. Grover noted that the "advisory" nature of the Board made the definition of "conflict of interest" different from what was applied to elected officials or a quasi-judicial entity such as the Zoning Hearing Board. He noted that any conflicts of interest for the Board were not as significant as for those other entities. Mr. Grover noted that even a Councilmember who recused themselves due to a conflict of interest could vote if it was necessary to break a tie vote or reach a decision, so long as the conflict was stated. He stated that he was more involved in these issues of that import than his deputies were. Mr. Grover noted that under the State Ethics Act, the exposure of advisory bodies was negligible, because they were only making recommendations on action to another body.

Mr. Grover noted that he would meet with the Planning Bureau to understand the Board's concerns and determine the most appropriate way forward, but noted that his office was understaffed and that other issues may take priority; thus, there may be a delay in providing a response to the Board. Mrs. Gribble stated that if the residency issue was fairly well-established under existing regulations, the Board could direct more of its attention to conflicts of interest.

Mr. Grover encourage the Board to forward recommendations to City Council or Mayor for appointments to the existing vacancies. Mr. Knight noted that there was one pending nomination. Mr. Grover noted that various boards throughout the city were struggling with a general lack of public interest, noting that some were so understaffed that they no longer had a quorum and could not meet.

Mr. Knight stated that despite any delays that may occur due to capacity issues on the City's end, work to update the by-laws should continue. He noted that the discussion was still valid and that there was draft documentation regarding proposed changes that could be refined until any final determinations were made by the Law Bureau.

Mrs. Tennis asked for some clarity regarding the primary concerns about the proposed changes; Mr. Grover noted that the primary issue was that the Board could not take away any authority of the State or granted to the local government, and that if the Board wanted to make changes to the by-laws, the City needed to understand the necessary legislative steps those make require.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

2. Discussion of Alternative Materials

Ms. Rucker stated that she felt the Board should focus on having a unified response when asked by the public about its approach to alternative materials for features like windows and doors. She noted that the Board had received a number of proposals and requests for alternative products; she stated that in their testimony for 1504 Penn Street, the Applicants referred to a previous approval granted by the Board for an alternative product and noted that the Board had to be consistent in how it considered and reviewed such proposals. Ms. Rucker stated that the Board should not be randomly approving or denying products, and that any variation from their standards required a strong justification.

Mr. Knight stated that it was an issue that concerned him during his tenure with the City as well, noting that proposals for alternative material-clad wood windows were not supported by the Planning Bureau and, in the past, had not been supported by the Board either. He stated that allowing a vinyl-wrapped wood product but not a fully vinyl window would become a slippery slope; an Applicant could simply state that they appeared to be the same from the outside, so if the Board approved the vinyl-wrapped material, they'd have to also approve the fully-vinyl material.

Mr. Knight referenced the issue of illegally-installed windows and doors raised by a concern resident at a previous HARB meeting, in which the owner of 1504 Penn Street had illegally replaced historic wood windows and doors with alternative products. He noted that the owner might want to claim that there was a specialized method to paint his windows as well and thus his project should be permitted; he observed that the Board would likely deny such a proposal, but that if a property owner complained to City Council and made note of any prior approvals, they may be permitted to retain inappropriate elements.

Mr. Knight reference the case regarding 1504 Penn Street reviewed earlier in the evening, and noted that the “benefits” that the Applicant was outlining about the product were largely irrelevant from the perspective of the Board and thus should not be a consideration in whether to approve the project. Mr. Grover asked whether the Applicant in that case had been correct in asserting that the same product had previously been approved by the Board; Mr. Knight stated that he would have to review the minutes of the referenced case.

Ms. Rucker noted that the Applicant in that case had stated that the product (Enduraclad) was paintable; Mr. Knight confirmed that was accurate. Ms. Rucker noted that she had not recommended approval of that application. Mr. Knight noted that she was likely referring to the window replacement project at 1716 Green Street; Ms. Rucker stated that there was a similar project in the Shipoke neighborhood. Mr. Knight stated that he recalled that issue but that the former Historic Preservation Specialist, Frank Grumbine, had been the Board's staff at the time. Mr. Knight noted that in that instance, the window was on a secondary elevation in the rear of the building and minimally-visible from the street, but noted that it also highlighted how each project was reviewed separately and contextually. He stated that a replacement window for a home in an attached row of similar buildings would be considered differently than for the same property if all the adjacent buildings had been demolished, but noted that that nuance was often not appreciated by the general public. Mr. Knight noted that Applicants often didn't want products that were high quality or historically-appropriate, they wanted cheap options with limited maintenance, and stated that those types of products were often contrary to historic preservation standards.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

Mr. Knight acknowledged that at a certain point, the Board might have to concede that allowance of some alternative materials was necessary – for example, if manufacturers simply stopped selling wooden windows. He also noted that in some products, new wood options were not the same quality as older wood products and might rot or mold faster; in those instances, alternative materials would make more sense.

Mrs. Gribble stated that she felt that the Board was conflicted in some cases, noting that some of the products being proposed lasted longer than cheaper wooden options, and asked whether the Board should prioritize the longevity and materiality of individual architectural features, or the longevity and appearance of the overall façade. She stated that extruded products generally had sharper and cleaner angles; Mrs. Tennis stated they sometimes had thinner frames. Mrs. Gribble stated that if the Board was willing to consider the Fibrex material, they should be evaluating more options as well.

Mr. Knight stated that while the Board should be open to considering alternatives, they needed to establish firmer boundaries on what was appropriate and why, and enforce those positions in their consideration of proposals. Mrs. Gribble agreed and stated that the Board needed to determine where those lines were drawn. Mr. Knight stated that he felt the Board had clearly established such a standard with the requirement that a material be paintable without voiding the warranty and without requiring special treatment.

Mr. Knight stated that he didn't feel having a single allowable paint material (Kynar in the instance of 1504 Penn Street) that needed to be applied by a specialized contractor was reasonable, as such an individual might not be readily available or affordable. Ms. Rucker noted that the Applicant was a contractor's representative, and thus was incentivized to highlight the benefits of the product and avoid drawbacks. Mr. Knight agreed and noted that the contractor's job was to say what was necessary to get the owner to buy the product and the Board to approve it.

Mrs. Gribble stated that the Board needed more education on available products, noting that there were big differences between higher-end and lower-end products of the same material. Mrs. Tennis noted that a high-end product could be installed poorly, in which case the specifics of the product would not matter.

Mr. Knight stated that he felt having a conversation lead by an individual with expertise in managing and regulating historic districts would be the best option; he noted that the Board could have manufacturer's representatives give presentations on their products, but that they would likely receive a one-sided accounting. He stated that he would reach out the former Historic Preservation Specialist, Frank Grumbine, to see if he was available or could recommend a knowledgeable expert. Mrs. Gribble noted that the best option was always in-situ repair or restoration of the architectural element; Mrs. Tennis stated that in-situ repair could be expensive and that it may require multiple restoration experts working on a single feature such as a window. Mrs. Gribble stated that it might be helpful to have a threshold at which features should be repair versus when they should be replaced. She stated that it would be preferable to have information on all of the available products, and samples of those products, and to have a third-party review that documentation and provide recommendations.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
January 9, 2023**

Mr. Grover noted that the Board had recommended products as “test cases” in the past, which did not establish a precedent upon which other proposals for that product did not have to be approved, and would allow the Board to review its appropriateness over time. Mr. Knight noted that he had considered making that recommendation for the current case. He stated that Fibrex had begun as a test case, and that Frank Grumbine had followed up with on-site inspections and observations after several years, and had confirmed that it had aged and weathered with cracking, warping, or otherwise degrading. Mr. Knight stated that using “test case” authorizations would at least prevent future applicants from using prior approvals as precedents.

Mr. Knight noted that manufacturer marketing materials could be unreliable, noting that in some cases they labeled their products as “composites” when they were simply a combination of inappropriate materials and not a wood composite material. He stated that property owners could likely not be expected to ascertain the difference, noting that even he had some difficulties in evaluating the materials against approvable specifications. Mrs. Gribble stated that she encountered the same issues in her professional work as an architect.

Mr. Knight stated that he would try to collect information on various window products, and coordinate with Frank Grumbine to have him review the information and attend the next meeting to speak about the appropriateness of various materials and window products. Mrs. Gribble suggested that Planning Bureau staff review other communities’ standards to see what they considered appropriate. Mr. Knight stated that getting confirmation on the appropriateness of materials from Frank Grumbine would give them more confidence in reviewing projects moving forward.

ADJOURNMENT: 9:03 PM

Mr. Henry moved, and Ms. Rucker seconded the motion, to adjourn. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (4-0).