

MINUTES

**HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
February 6, 2023
THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. CITY GOVERNMENT CENTER
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Trina Gribble, Chair
Kali Tennis, Vice Chair
Bruce Henry, Deputy Codes Administrator
April Rucker
Camille Bennett

MEMBERS ABSENT: N/A

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:

Minutes for the January 9th HARB meeting had not been prepared as of the February meeting, and thus there were no minutes on which to take action.

OLD BUSINESS:

- 1. 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 Applicants were not in attendance at the meeting. Mrs. Gribble asked Planning Bureau staff whether the Applicants would be in attendance; Mr. Knight stated that he was not apprised by the Applicants that they would not be in attendance. Mrs. Gribble stated that the application would be moved to the end of the meeting in the event that the Applicants showed up.

The Applicants were not in attendance by the end of the meeting.

At the end of the meeting, Mr. Knight noted that the Board had to determine what action to take on the application. He stated that while he did not support the project, there may have been extenuating circumstances that prevented the Applicants from attending. He recommended that the Board continue the case.

Mr. Henry moved, and Ms. Bennett seconded the motion, to Table the application. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

HARB Meeting Minutes February 6, 2023

2. 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 and Dennis Trgo with Grand Opening Windows & Doors (the contractor), 931 East Main Street, New Kingston, PA 17072 (aka “the Applicants”).

The Applicants handed out documentation to the Board members and noted that the Board had previously requested that the project utilize a six-over-six pane configuration. They stated that they were requesting approval for vinyl windows because they were in the third-floor dormers and stated that they were good-looking windows that were not cheap. They noted that the project originally proposed four-over-four windows, but that they could change the project to use six-over-six vinyl windows with simulated divided lite grills.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the Applicants had made changes to the front door that was originally proposed. The Applicants noted that they would require HARB approval for the installation of a steel door in any style, but were willing to utilize a solid paneled door without a pane. They noted that metal storm doors were permitted and stated that it would be a justification for use of a steel door. The Applicants provided additional documentation regarding door samples for the Board members to review. Mr. Grover asked the Applicants to show the revised door to Planning Bureau staff

Mrs. Gribble noted that Planning Bureau staff had recommended the project be denied at the previous month’s meeting, and referenced the justification from the case report. She noted that given the changes to the project, including the agreement to use a six-over-six, simulated divided lite design, the primary issue was with respect to the materiality. The Applicants brought out a sample of the proposed window product for the Board members’ review. Mrs. Gribble asked if dividers could be installed between the glass panes; the Applicants confirmed that they could use those as well. The Applicants stated that all vinyl products were not the same, and that some used better materials and manufacturing than others.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the product came with installed window screens; the Applicants confirm that they did.

Mrs. Gribble stated that the Board had been struggling with how to approach the issue of materiality in new windows. The Applicants stated that replacing all the windows in the home with wood or wood composite windows would cost \$30,000. Mr. Knight noted that the current project was only proposing the replacement of the third-floor dormers, and thus the project cost would not be that exorbitant. The Applicants stated that they intended to replace all the windows in the home eventually.

Mrs. Gribble asked the other Board members for their thoughts on the materiality of the proposed windows. Mrs. Tennis stated that she was not comfortable approving vinyl windows, and that she felt the internal divided lite mullions were not appropriate either. She noted that while Fibrex

HARB Meeting Minutes

February 6, 2023

windows may be expensive, there were other approvable window products the Applicants could consider.

The property owner stated that he was confused as to why his windows were considered historic whereas his neighbors had been allowed to install windows recently, and asked whether they were a different material. Mr. Knight confirmed that he had coordinated with contractors on projects at nearby properties that were damaged by a fire, required them to retain the existing windows, and that he had instructed the contractors to remove unpermitted windows that had been installed and replace them with the existing windows. He stated that if the Applicants were aware of any other projects that had used inappropriate materials, that those projects had not received approval from the Planning Bureau. Mr. Knight stated that if projects had been done without Planning Bureau approval, he would issue violation notices and require replacement with appropriate materials or the submittal of an after-the-fact COA application.

The Applicants asked whether that applied to the pane configuration as well, noting that some of the windows featured one-over-one pane configurations. Mr. Knight confirmed that some of the windows did have that configuration, but noted that he had reviewed all the properties on the block via Google Streets View, and that it appeared most of those windows had been installed prior to 2011, which was the oldest images available. He stated that he couldn't confirm what occurred in those situations, as the installations predated his tenure with the City, but noted that he could review the Codes Bureau's records to ascertain when, specifically, the work was done.

Mrs. Gribble noted that it was standard practice for the Board to follow the City's Historic District Design Guidelines and the National Park Service's regulations, and that neither supported the use of vinyl products. Mrs. Gribble asked Mr. Henry for his opinion; he stated that he didn't feel the vinyl product was appropriate. Ms. Bennett and Ms. Rucker concurred.

The Applicants asked about the standards for windows in the rear of the property; Mrs. Gribble noted that the Board only had purview over aspects visible from the public right-of-way. The Applicants asked whether they could install a vinyl window in the rear of the property; Mr. Knight confirmed that the rear of the property was visible from Rose Street.

The Applicants stated that only replacing the window panes would be a waste of money, since the entire window frames were deteriorated and required replacing. Mr. Knight stated that only replacing the glass panes may not be effective or historically-appropriate. He noted that the Planning was currently in the process of researching alternative window products and having a discussion with the Board that would include input from the former Historic Preservation Specialist, Frank Grumbine, so that the Board could consider expanding the list of approvable replacement window products. The Applicants asked if there was a preliminary list of those products. Mrs. Gribble stated that the intent of that discussion was to consider the alternatives and potentially develop an expanded list, so they did not currently have such a list.

The property owner stated that his neighbor used a contractor (Greenawalt Roofing) which had installed windows and siding in a vinyl material on the dormers; he stated that the project had been approved by the City, but noted that his project had been denied, and asked why he had been treated differently than his neighbors if both properties were considered historic. Mr. Knight

HARB Meeting Minutes February 6, 2023

requested the specific property address to research the project, but stated emphatically that neither the Board nor the Planning Bureau had approved the use of vinyl products at that location. He stated that if vinyl products were used, that it was not with any City approvals and would constitute an historic district violation. Mrs. Tennis stated that the Board's meeting minutes and the Historic District Design Guidelines were on the City's website if the Applicants wanted to confirm that approval for the referenced project had not been authorized by the Board.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the Board wanted to consider the proposed vinyl windows and steel door separately, or consider them as a single project; she asked whether Board members had issues with the proposed door material. Mr. Knight noted that during his recent site visits to the block, he observed that there were more changes to the entry doors than there were the windows, and confirmed that some of the properties had steel doors. He noted he had researched the properties via Google Streets View, and that several of the properties appeared to have paneled steel doors as far back as the earliest Google images.

Mrs. Tennis stated that she felt the six-panel steel door was an improvement over the initially-proposed door. Mrs. Tennis asked whether the transom would be replaced; the Applicants stated that the transom would remain as-is.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the Board wanted to approve the proposed door and deny the proposed windows

Mr. Tennis moved, and Ms. Rucker seconded the motion, to Approve with Additional Conditions; the additional conditions were that the proposed paneled steel door could be approved, but the proposed vinyl windows would be denied. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

The Applicants asked whether they could use windows in the rear of the property if they were not visible; Mr. Knight confirmed that the rear of the property was visible.

3. 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 Caitlin Siegrist and Joe Turnowchyk with Hex 9 Architects (the project architects), 620 East Oregon Road, Lititz, PA 17543 (aka "the Applicants").

Mrs. Gribble noted that the Applicants had made revisions to the proposal previously reviewed at the January meeting, asked the them to provide some background on the changes. The Applicants stated that while the property owner was not in attendance, they had granted the project team approval to agree to any revisions on their behalf.

The Applicants noted that while the property was in an historic district, it was not an historic building, and noted that all four sides were visible and thus subject to review criteria. They noted that the Board had indicated that the previous design was not "cohesive" enough. They stated that the revised design proposed slightly different colors of manufactured stone for the front elevation,

HARB Meeting Minutes

February 6, 2023

which created a more cohesive look for the front façade. Mrs. Gribble asked whether the project proposed removing the existing brick from the building; the Applicants confirmed that was the case and noted that the brick would be removed regardless of the approved façade treatment. They noted that the project would wrap the same stone veneer around the side of the building.

The Applicants stated that the existing fenestrations would remain on the side, and noted that they were not trying to visualize consolidate the openings. They noted that they were including accent panels at some spots to tie the first and second floors together. They noted that they were proposing to use wider siding than previously discussed because the proposed stone tiles were 12” tall. The Applicants stated that the second floor would have a slightly lighter shade of stone to break up the appearance of the elevations.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there were any questions or comments from the other Board members regarding the proposed changes.

Mrs. Tennis referenced the gray siding on one of the elevations and asked what the material was; Ms. Rucker noted that it was metal siding. The Applicants confirmed that and noted that it was included on the original proposal as well. Mrs. Tennis asked whether the color was a solid brown or would have some differentiation; the Applicants stated that it would have a “wood grain” appearance because the property owner wanted to incorporate wooden elements in the design, but that they wanted a more durable product than wood, especially since the building was on the riverfront. Ms. Rucker stated that she liked the appearance.

Mrs. Tennis stated that the faux wood siding was contrasted against the proposed stone veneer; the Applicants stated that the material was designed to break up the otherwise gray façade materials. They noted that they had incorporated the material at other locations, including in the rear of the second floor where the lack of building massing created a different appearance.

Mrs. Tennis noted that the rear of the second floor was more fragmented than the rest of the building, and asked how the Applicants approached that area. They noted that the property owner did not require as much space on the second floor, and that structural issues also prevented them from enclosing all of the second-floor space in the rear. They noted that many of the rear portions of residential structures in the surrounding neighborhood had a similar appearance; Mrs. Tennis noted that the design would make sense if it were in a row of homes not visible from the street, but that the subject property was highly visible along all elevations, and thus it detracted from the attractive appearance of the front and side elevations.

The Applicants stated that the massing of structures on the rear roof had not changed from the previous meeting. Mrs. Tennis noted that the previous design had had so many materials that she had not noted the appearance of the small additions in the rear of the second-floor roof. Ms. Rucker confirmed that and asked whether the façade treatment on the rear of the building had been brick; the Applicants confirmed that had utilized more materials in the original proposal. Mrs. Tennis stated that the proposed second-floor additions blended into the proposed façade materials in the previous design. Mrs. Gribble agreed and noted that the area was more prominent with less differentiation in façade materials and color.

HARB Meeting Minutes

February 6, 2023

The Applicants noted the current proposal included a lighter cedar wood color while the original design proposed a darker walnut color. Ms. Rucker stated that she liked the lighter cedar color. Mrs. Tennis stated that she felt the additions on the rear of the roof were more prominent with the revised color scheme and that she felt it appeared too cluttered.

Mrs. Gribble stated that she felt the massing was more “successful” in the revised design because of the proposed material and color changes, but that she felt incorporating the façade treatments from the second-story roof additions into the ground floor would help the design feel more cohesive. She reiterated that the revised design was more successful for the front of the building, but that individual mechanical elements in the rear were being accentuated when they should be minimized within the overall appearance of the building. The Applicants stated that they could integrate the façade treatments on the upper floor with ground floor siding; they stated that they did not want to remove all the accents around the façade. Mrs. Gribble stated that she understood why the Applicants wanted to break up the otherwise monotone appearance of the building.

Mrs. Gribble stated that she understood why the Applicants wanted to have the building reflect the rowhome appearance that was predominant in the surrounding neighborhood. She stated that she felt the proposed color scheme might be too modern. She inquired about the proposed façade materials and specifically whether the proposed veneer was a real stone material. The Applicants confirmed that it was a stone material that could come in several different textures.

The Applicants stated that another reason for the varied façade treatments around the building was that they wanted it to have a Cubist appearance as a modern renovation, which would result in different appearances for different structural elements. They stated that they could bring façade elements from the first floor up to the second-floor roof and create a structure to incorporate all the rooftop additions. Mrs. Gribble noted that it might be difficult to do, but asked whether there was a way to incorporate all the second-floor structures into a single addition; she stated that she was concerned that the rear of the structure did not reflect the surrounding architecture as much as the revised design for the front elevation did. Mrs. Gribble noted that the National Park Service’s standards recommended that new construction replicate the rhythm and dimensions of surrounding properties.

Mrs. Gribble inquired about the Board members’ thoughts on the façade materials. Ms. Rucker stated that she liked the colors, but that she didn’t think the design should try to reflect the residential buildings across the street. Mr. Henry stated that he felt the front elevation accomplished the goal of recreating the rowhouse look from the surrounding neighborhood, especially with respect to the rear of those structures, but that he felt some of the second-floor additions in the rear were too prominent. The Applicants noted that the roof of the stair tower in the rear was intentionally angled, but that the slope could be reduced, and confirmed that roof above the adjacent kitchen space was flat.

The Applicants noted that the plan intended to consolidate the stair tower to the second floor with the existing stair tower from the basement to the first floor; they noted that they couldn’t change the orientation of the second-floor stair tower without losing space on the first floor.

HARB Meeting Minutes February 6, 2023

Mrs. Tennis acknowledged the challenges that the existing building layout and height provided, and stated that her concern was that the building would create a precedent for other buildings along Front Street that were constructed around the same time period. She noted that two adjacent properties were currently empty and that if they were to undergo significant exterior changes, they might look to this project for guidance. Mrs. Tennis stated that she didn't feel the proposed metal siding related to any of the architectural elements in the surrounding neighborhood or other commercial buildings along Front Street.

The Applicants asked whether the Board would support consolidating the various structures on the rear of the second-floor roof into a larger structure with a peaked roof. They stated that they could then utilize the faux wood or gray siding; they noted this would create a more cohesive appearance to the structure while tying together the second-floor and first-floor façades. Mrs. Gribble asked whether they were considering a gable roof on the proposed consolidated enclosure; the Applicants stated that it would likely have a shallow gable roof. Mrs. Gribble stated that she felt the consolidated structure should retain a mono-pitch roof.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there were any more concerns from the Board members about the second-floor additions. Mrs. Tennis stated that the proposed faux wood siding was too differentiated from the rest of the building's façade treatments. The Applicants reiterated that the faux wood siding had been a darker color under the previous design proposal and noted that they could reuse that original color. Mrs. Gribble stated that it was more of an issue that the siding color of the building additions was so differentiated from the other façade surfaces, and noted that if the faux wood siding was incorporated below the stair tower on the first floor, it might help that element blend in. The Applicants noted that they could incorporate some of the siding from the second-floor structures on the northern elevation of the first floor. Mrs. Tennis stated that she felt it would help incorporate those structures into the overall appearance of the building.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the proposed siding was a sheet product or would be installed in a lap siding configuration; the Applicants confirmed that it was a clapboard siding product, with a similar profile. Mrs. Tennis stated that she had often seen the product used in construction in Philadelphia.

There was some deliberation amongst the Board members which was not audible.

Mrs. Gribble provided an overview of the project and outlined the various façade treatments and building massing that were under consideration by the Board. She stated that it sounded as though the main issue was the accentuation of the second-floor structures. Mrs. Gribble noted that the project was challenging, given the high visibility of the building on all sides and the architectural context of the surrounding neighborhood. Mrs. Tennis stated that she felt the design was moving in a better direction, but wasn't sure how the Board should proceed.

The Applicants noted that they could incorporate some of the colors and materials from the initial design for the second-floor structures in order to minimize the contrast of those elements against the rest of the building. Mr. Henry noted that in the previous design, the façade of the proposed stair tower was the same as the first-floor façade below it, which helped it blend in. The Applicants

HARB Meeting Minutes February 6, 2023

noted that the proposed siding was narrower as well in the previous design, and confirmed that they could have the façade treatment for the stair tower match that of the first floor.

Mr. Henry stated that the profile and roofs of the second-floor structures should be addressed. The Applicants stated that there were two potential solutions: they could put gabled roofs over the second-floor structures, or they could utilize two, separate, symmetrical roof pitches. Mrs. Gribble stated that she felt it would complement the building better to use two roof pitches. They stated that creating a larger, singular structure with a roof would be more harmonious than multiple roofs atop different structures.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Board members if they wanted to Table the application until the following meeting to allow them to address concerns in a revised project design.

Ms. Bennett asked what her current recommendations were for the project as revised. Mrs. Gribble stated that it sounded as though the Board appreciated the overall design, but that there were concerns about the small area of faux-wood metal siding relative to the overall façade; Mrs. Tennis added that there was some concern about the small size and disconnected nature of the second-floor structures and that they didn't appear to be appropriate for a commercial building. She also noted the significant contrast because the façade treatments of the second-floor structures and the rest of the building. Mrs. Gribble noted during the previous meeting, the Board had concerns about the number, arrangement, and texture of façade treatments, which the Applicants had addressed in the revised design.

Mr. Knight noted that the primary issue in the previous design was the number of façade treatments and the manner in which they were applied around the exterior of the proposed building, and stated that the revised design created a more uniform look by reducing the number of differentiated façade treatments and applying them in larger sections around the building. Mr. Knight reiterated that the revised design had addressed that major concern, and noted that the remaining concerns were related to consolidating individual structures on the second-floor roof and tying the façade design of those structures into the first floor. Mrs. Gribble and Mr. Henry concurred with that assessment.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Board members if they wanted to incorporate those comments into a formal motion.

Mr. Henry motioned to Table the application until the March HARB meeting to allow the Applicants to return with renderings showing various color alternatives for the façade treatments. Mr. Knight noted that if it were simply an issue of color preferences, the Board should probably take a vote on the current proposal, because otherwise choosing colors was a subjective issue and not a standard generally held by the Board. Mrs. Gribble asked the other Board members whether they wanted to Table the application. Ms. Rucker noted that issue was only related to color and that she didn't think it was necessary to continue the review until the following meeting.

Mr. Henry noted that the motion could have a condition of approval that the façade treatment for the stair tower blend into the first-floor façade below it. Ms. Rucker asked whether there should be a condition regarding changes to the second-floor structures.

HARB Meeting Minutes February 6, 2023

Mrs. Gribble noted that Mr. Henry was rescinding his motion to Table the application, and that a new motion for approval with a condition that the stair tower façade be incorporated into the first-floor façade; she asked whether the Board's resolution was applied to all of the second-floor structures. Mrs. Tennis stated that she wanted to "harmonize" the second-floor structures with the rest of the building.

There was some deliberation amongst the Board members which was not audible. Mr. Knight requested clarification on whether the Board wanted all the second-floor additions or just the stair tower in the rear to match the first-floor façade. Mrs. Tennis stated that they didn't necessarily want to check the materials, but that they wanted to reduce the contrasting elements.

There was some internal discussion regarding how the condition should be worded. Mr. Knight stated that the Board should define exactly what they wanted to see changed, but not necessarily specify what that change would look like. The Applicants attempted to clarify the issues. They noted there were three separate issues related to the Board's pending motion, including: 1) having the stair tower façade matching the first-floor façade below it; 2) that the stair tower enclosure would be extended to the northern elevation of the first floor to "ground" the second-floor additions; and 3) to extend the roof of the stair tower to cover the adjacent mechanical systems enclosure.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the mechanical systems enclosure would be constructed of the same material as the stair tower; the Applicants stated that they could have it match the façade treatment of the stair tower although it would have to include louvers to meet building code requirements. Mrs. Tennis stated that she felt the façade of the mechanical area

Mrs. Gribble moved, and Ms. Bennett seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff and Additional Conditions; the additional conditions were that the: 1) that the stair tower enclosure will be extended to the northern elevation of the first floor to "ground" the second-floor additions; 2) the façade of the expanded stair tower enclosure will match the first-floor façade below it; and 3) the roof of the stair tower will be enlarged to cover the adjacent mechanical systems enclosure. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

NEW BUSINESS:

4. 1624 Green Street, filed by Peter Rowan, to install a stainless-steel chimney pipe in the façade on the northern elevation.

The case was represented by Mike Cahill with AES Hearth & Patio (the contractor), 4303 Carlisle Pike, Camp Hill, PA 17011; and Peter Rowan (the property owner), 1624 Green Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102 (aka "the Applicants").

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

1. The chimney supports will be anchored through mortar joints in the brick façade, and will not be anchored through any masonry surfaces.

HARB Meeting Minutes February 6, 2023

2. The Applicant will coordinate with the Codes Bureau and Fire Bureau for any necessary approvals regarding the installation of an exterior chimney.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicants whether he wanted to provide additional information on the proposal; they stated that they did not and were happy to answer any questions from the Board members.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there was an existing chimney and the project proposed to replace it; the Applicants confirmed that the project involved the installation of a new pipe.

Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicants if they could rehabilitate the existing chimney to accommodate a new vent pipe for the proposed stove. They stated that they had conducted a “level 3 inspection” and that the current chimney did not have continuous path from the first floor to the roof; they noted that this was common in older buildings that may have undergone significant rehab work. They stated that this required them to utilize an external chimney stack.

Mrs. Tennis inquired as to how high above the existing roofline the proposed chimney would extend. The Applicants stated that it would extend two to three feet above the parapet wall, and that the installation would be subject to code requirements regarding size and height. Mrs. Tennis asked how tall the existing brick chimney was; the Applicants stated that they were not sure.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether it was possible to run the chimney internally. The Applicants stated that a chimney run internally would require it to be boxed in with two inches of clearance on all sides, and would constitute a major project.

Mrs. Gribble asked the other Board members for their thoughts on the materiality of the proposed windows. Ms. Rucker and Ms. Bennett stated that they had no comments.

Mrs. Tennis noted that she understood that the Applicants could not utilize the existing chimney flue, but stated that she felt the proposed metal chimney was very obvious and compromise the historic character of the property and district; she stated that it had an industrial feel to it. She asked if the property had an existing fire place. The Applicants stated that the property did not have an existing fireplace and that they would be building a custom hearth with a wood stove on top of it, connecting to the proposed chimney through a penetration in the wall.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the stove would be the primary heating source in the home or a secondary heating source. The contractor stated that they generally did zoned-heat or district heating projects. Mrs. Tennis asked if there was a compelling reason to install the proposed stove and chimney; the property owner stated that he grew up with wood stoves and that his previous home near Italian Lake had a wood stove as well. Mrs. Tennis asked whether there was a place to install the stove and chimney pipe so that it wasn't as prominent from the street. The Applicants noted that the first floor often got cold in the winter, and the contractor noted that many of their customers installed wood stoves to supplement their main heating source, as the cost of fuel was rising. Ms. Rucker asked what the main heating source was; the Applicants confirmed that the home used gas heat.

HARB Meeting Minutes February 6, 2023

Mrs. Gribble stated that her main concerns were the visual appearance of the pipe and the destruction to the brick façade created by the penetration of the chimney pipe; she asked how large the hole in the building wall would be. The Applicants stated that the penetration needed to be about 12 inches by 12 inches.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Board members whether they wanted to require that the chimney pipe be painted.

Mrs. Tennis referenced the rendering provided by the Applicants and asked how the chimney pipe would be anchored to the exterior wall; the Applicants confirmed that it would be anchored through the mortar joints, and that they would have three total anchor straps with one being screwed into wood right below the top of the parapet wall. Mrs. Tennis asked whether the chimney pipe would be galvanized aluminum; the Applicants confirmed that it would be stainless steel inside and outside, and that it could be easily disassembled and reassembled.

The Applicants asked whether the Board's main concern was the height of the chimney above the roof; Mrs. Tennis stated that her main concern was the contrast in appearance between the historic chimney and the proposed stainless-steel pipe, reiterating that it was very visible from the street. She stated that she felt the chimney had a very industrial look that was inappropriate for the historic district.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there was another location that the pipe could be installed; Ms. Rucker asked whether it was possible to install the chimney on the rear of the home. The Applicants stated that if the building had a cathedral ceiling, it may be easier to redesign the chimney so that it was less visible, but that changing the proposed design to something less visible would cost twice as much.

Mr. Grover noted that the Planning Bureau's case report indicated that a similar proposal had been approved by the Board for another property in an historic district, and asked why that project would be approved while the current project would not. He stated that the Board had an obligation to the public to consistently apply the rules unless they had changed.

Mr. Knight confirmed that the Board had approved a similar chimney at 317 Herr Street in November 2019; he noted that the former Historic Preservation Specialist, Frank Grumbine, had recommended approval in that case. Mr. Knight noted that he had based his recommendation on the current project based on the prior approval recommendation, noting that Mr. Grumbine was more knowledgeable about historic preservation issues than he was. He stated that if Mr. Grumbine had recommended denial in that case, he would have done so for the current project. Mrs. Tennis inquired as to where the chimney had been located in that project. Mr. Knight noted that the chimney in that instance was much more visible than in the current proposal, because it was installed on the side that faced a surface parking lot, so that it was visible from multiple streets.

Ms. Rucker moved, and Mr. Henry seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a majority vote (4-1).

HARB Meeting Minutes
February 6, 2023

- 5. 100 Pine Street, filed by Chris Howells with Mowery Construction, to replace the existing first-floor façade and planting area along North Front Street with an indoor/outdoor assembly space for entertainment and receptions, including the installation of a new wall and fence enclosing the space.**

The case was represented by Dan Gagliano with Mowery Construction (the project architect), 1000 Bent Creek Boulevard, Mechanicsburg, PA 17050 (aka “the Applicant”).

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

1. The proposed concrete knee wall will be replaced with a brick knee wall, to better match the façade of the building and to conform to the regulations for fences in the RF district outlined in Section 7-307.9(d) of the Zoning Code.
2. All elements of the proposed knee wall and fence, including the decorative archway, will be limited to six feet in height.
3. All new construction will be constructed along the property line or within the site itself and will not encroach into the public right-of-way.

Mrs. Gribble asked Planning Bureau staff if the restriction limiting the fence to six feet in height was measured from the sidewalk or the surface of the patio on-site. Mr. Knight noted that the Zoning Code was not clear on the issue, but that the Planning Bureau’s position was that it was measured from the adjacent sidewalk.

The Applicant noted that the wall on which the fence was constructed was about three feet high at the sidewalk level and that he felt it would look strange if there was only a three-foot-high fence on top of that. Mr. Knight noted that the height restriction was a zoning issue and would require a Variance approval by the Zoning Hearing Board. He noted that the Planning Commission was generally reluctant to approve high fences along Front Street. Mr. Knight suggested that the Applicant lower the height of the knee wall to create better proportions. The Applicant stated that they could likely redesign the wall and fence, or the patio floor.

The Applicant asked whether the condition regarding a brick knee wall also applied to the proposed concrete end piers; Mr. Knight stated that he understood the concrete knee wall design was intended to match the existing frieze on the building, but noted that the consistency of horizontal elements around the building defined its International architectural style, and confirmed that the concrete piers could be retained as they matched the existing concrete building supports. He noted that the property already had a low, brick knee wall on the northern and southern sides of the building. The Applicant asked whether the brick wall could be capped with concrete tiles and coping; Mr. Knight noted that the decision was ultimately up to the Board, but that he felt either precast concrete or brick coping would be acceptable.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant to discuss patio area, railings, and the proposed floor-to-ceiling doors. The Applicant noted that although the property had been constructed in 1966, the railings around the property had been replaced with the current Art Deco design in 1991; he noted that the proposed fence design attempted to fuse these styles together with a “portal” in the fence that provides framed views from the courtyard to the river. He stated that the project proposed to

HARB Meeting Minutes

February 6, 2023

replace some of the floor-to-ceiling storefront windows along the front elevation with a folding glass door installation; they noted that this would open former office space to the terrace to create an indoor/outdoor entertainment space. Mrs. Gribble inquired about the proposed surface of the patio. The Applicant stated that it would be concrete with some accents that would be compatible with the overall architecture. Mrs. Gribble noted that while the Board did not have purview over interior spaces, the project presented an interesting issue in that it created indoor/outdoor space that may be subject to the Board's review.

Mrs. Gribble noted that the proposed folding doors had a yellow or golden color and asked whether that was the intention; the Applicant stated that they had intended to use that, although the product was not available in that color so they were considering using a dark bronze, which would match the existing storefront window frames.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there were any questions or comments from the other Board members regarding the project.

Mr. Henry asked Planning Bureau staff about the zoning regulations for fences, and whether the proposed portal and other ornamentation was considered part of the fence height; Mr. Knight stated that he considered that to be the case, because he would otherwise be setting a precedent by allowing a deviation, which was not something he felt was appropriate. He noted that the proposed fence was already a bit ambiguous with respect to the Zoning Code, as front yard fences were not permitted by right in the Riverfront zoning district; however, he noted that the wall for the front yard planter box reasonably created an existing, non-conforming aspect which would permit the wall/fence proposal. The Applicant asked whether the Planning Bureau was requiring the top of the portal to be lowered to the existing fence height; Mr. Knight confirmed that was correct. The Applicant noted that the building originally had a fence where the planter box was located, which supported the Planning Bureau's non-conforming aspect determination.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the piers at the ends of the wall/fence would also be subject to the fence height restriction, and would be constructed no higher than six feet; Mr. Knight confirmed that was correct and stated that he didn't know whether the Applicant want the portal to be higher than the piers, but in no case was any element allowed to be taller than six feet. Mr. Knight stated that if the Board wanted to support a fence higher than six feet, they should include a condition that the Applicant receive Variance approval from the Zoning Hearing Board; he stated that he didn't think there would be a justification for such a request. The Applicant noted that the project proposed to install shrubs around the patio and asked whether those would be subject to the six-foot height limitation; Mr. Knight confirmed that they would not.

The Applicant noted that the Planning Bureau had included a condition regarding ensuring that the project stayed with the property lines, and noted that they had already received zoning approval to construct the wall/fence along the line of the existing planter wall; he asked whether that allowance was still granted. Mr. Knight confirmed that it was, noted that the existing planter extended further towards Front Street than the building frontage to the north, and that he had previously discussed this aspect with the property owner. He stated that he felt it was prudent to include it as a condition in the case report. He confirmed that the proposal seemed consistent with the Planning Bureau's recommendation.

HARB Meeting Minutes February 6, 2023

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the existing ADA ramps adjacent to the proposed patio would be retained; the Applicant confirmed that the ramp to the north of the patio would be removed, but the ramp to the south of the patio would be retained, and noted they were adding a gate to access the patio directly. He noted this would reflect the conditions in the original design of the building.

Mrs. Tennis inquired about the size of the existing pillars supporting the building; the Applicant noted that the existing pillars were about 24" x 14" and stated that the piers would be approximately the same size. Mrs. Tennis clarified that she was inquiring about the pillars running along the side of the building; the Applicants confirmed those were approximately 14" x 14" and that the piers would likely match the larger pillars in the center of the front façade.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the proposed folding doors collapsed into the walls; the Applicant clarified that they folded and stacked; he noted that they would be centered between the large pillars on the front façade. The Applicant noted that there would be a single egress door on the north side of the façade, which was required for emergency egress regulations. He confirmed that there would be no changes to the floor-to-ceiling windows on the sides of the front room.

Mrs. Gribble referenced Condition #1 in the Planning Bureau's case report, and asked the Board members about their thoughts on that condition. Mrs. Tennis asked what material the existing planter box utilized; Mr. Knight confirmed that the existing planter box was constructed of brick, as was the knee wall along the Pine Street side of the front yard area, and noted that the Planning Bureau's recommendation was to maintain this design instead of the proposed fluted concrete. Mrs. Tennis stated that she liked the appearance of the fluted concrete, because it made the space feel more like a patio.

Mrs. Gribble stated that she thought either the brick or the concrete was appropriate, but that she felt the presence of brick along Pine Street supported its use in the proposed design. Mr. Knight noted that the brick knee wall on the north side of the patio area would remain as well, which would create an undesirable contrast with the proposed concrete knee wall.

Mrs. Tennis stated that she liked the fluted concrete appearance in the proposed design because it helped define the space as the front of the building and created a better "flow." Mrs. Gribble noted that the International style architecture utilized horizontal bands, which would support the continuation of the brick treatment. Mrs. Tennis stated that she liked the concrete.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the other Board members had preferences regarding the knee wall being either brick or concrete. Ms. Rucker stated that she liked the concrete wall. Mr. Henry concurred.

Mrs. Gribble referenced Condition #2 in the Planning Bureau's case report, although she noted that a decision on the fence height was not within the Board's purview. Mrs. Tennis asked how high the proposed fence was; the Applicant stated that the top of the portal was seven-and-a-half-feet from the patio level, which itself was elevated ten inches above the sidewalk. Mrs. Tennis inquired as to how tall the first-floor glass windows were; the Applicant stated that they were about

HARB Meeting Minutes February 6, 2023

eleven feet in height and that the fence was designed to be in proportion to the windows. He stated that the primary consideration in the design was the experience for people on the property.

Mrs. Gribble noted that the proposed fence and portable incorporated a more modern design, and asked whether it would be painted the same color [note: green] as the other railings on the property; the Applicant confirmed that the proposed railings would be painted black.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the other Board members had concerns about the six-foot fence height limitation in the case report. Mrs. Tennis stated that she felt a lower fence would interfere with the view of the river; the Applicant stated that it would be at eye level when viewed from the patio. Mr. Knight stated that he understood the concern regarding visibility from the patio, but reminded the Board that their purview was how projects appeared from the outside. He noted that the proposed fence would be eight feet tall when viewed from Front Street, which would create an institutional appearance from an important and highly-visible corridor. He also noted that the security justification for the height was undermined by the proposed portal that would be installed in the fence. The Applicant stated that the portal would have bars within it. Mr. Knight noted that the design would thus undermine the intent of the portal by obscuring the visibility through it. The Applicant stated that it was more important as a focal point. Mr. Knight stated that he felt it was a poor justification for the inclusion of the portal.

Mr. Knight reiterated that the Board's main concern was having an eight-foot-high fence located along Front Street and stated that if this was proposed elsewhere on Front Street, the Board would likely deny such a proposal. He said the Board should consider the precedent such a decision would set. Mrs. Gribble agreed but stated that it would be helpful to tie the proposed fence design into the decorative elements of existing railings around the building. She stated that she didn't have comments on the proposed height, and felt that there may be some justification for having taller elements, such as the proposed piers.

The Applicant referenced the discussion of Condition #1 and noted that it was often difficult to match the color of existing brick with new brick, which he felt was a factor in favor of the proposed fluted concrete design. He stated that they could attempt to match the color of the existing brick and mortar. Mrs. Tennis stated that it could be difficult to match the shape of the brick, noting that the existing brick had rounded edges which might be difficult to match; she also noted that the existing brick had an aged patina on it that might be difficult to match.

Mrs. Gribble stated that in addition to the material of the knee wall surface, the Board should consider what kind of coping would top the wall, and whether that should be concrete or brick. She noted that it would likely depend on how the Board felt about the proposed wall face. The Applicant stated that if the Board determined that the knee wall should be brick, the coping should be as well, but noted that it didn't age as well due to the joints between the bricks.

Mrs. Gribble noted that it sounded as though the Board was leaning towards approval of the proposed fluted concrete design. Ms. Bennett stated that she preferred the brick wall. Ms. Rucker and Mrs. Tennis stated that they preferred the concrete design.

HARB Meeting Minutes February 6, 2023

Mrs. Gribble referenced Condition #3 in the Planning Bureau's case report. The Applicant stated that they had demonstrated they intended to comply with that condition.

Mrs. Gribble noted that the Board still needed to determine which wall material they preferred. Mrs. Tennis moved to approve the proposed fluted concrete design. Mrs. Gribble asked whether she was proposing to only make a motion on one of the conditions in the case report. Ms. Rucker stated that they should vote on the entire project. Mr. Knight and Mr. Grover noted that the Board could vote on conditions individually, or on the project as whole. Mrs. Tennis asked whether the Board wanted to take a single vote on the entire proposal; Ms. Rucker confirmed that was the case, and noted that Mrs. Tennis could recommend modifying the conditions in her motion.

Mrs. Tennis stated that she wanted to remove Condition #1 in the case report. Mr. Knight asked whether she was also proposing to remove Condition #2; Mrs. Tennis stated that she wasn't proposing its removal, but that she felt the proportions of the fence relative to the building supported having elements higher than six feet. She stated that everything the Board did was context-specific.

Mr. Grover asked what motion she was making; Mrs. Tennis stated that she wasn't making a motion because she wasn't sure what the consensus of the Board was. Mr. Grover stated that the Board needed to be clear about what actions they're taking and whether there was currently a motion on the floor.

Mrs. Gribble stated that there was a motion on the floor to approve the request with modified conditions, which included removing Conditions #1 & #2. Mr. Knight noted that any change to the second condition could not waive the fence height requirement and would have to require the Applicant to receive Variance approval from the Zoning Hearing Board. Mr. Grover stated that it wouldn't necessarily need to be included as a condition because it would be required by the Zoning Code. Ms. Bennett seconded the motion.

Mrs. Tennis moved, and Ms. Bennett seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff & Additional Conditions; the additional conditions were that Conditions #1 & #2 from the case report were removed. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Discussion of HARB by-laws

Mr. Knight noted the Mr. Grover would be providing an update regarding his department's review of the proposed by-law revisions.

Mr. Grover stated that the Ordinance and associated historic district map were somewhat vague in how they addressed Board member eligibility; he noted that the Ordinance stated that they must live in a municipal historic district, but that it wasn't clear whether that only applied to "Municipal Historic Districts" and not all such districts within the municipality. He noted that there were three different types of districts on the City's map: National, Municipal, and Eligible Historic Districts. Mr. Knight stated that he wasn't sure how the City's Ordinance should be interpreted in that regard. Mr. Grover noted that the City's map was approved by PHMC with all three types of districts, and that the City couldn't modify that map without their approval. Mr. Grover stated that Board members' eligibility had not historically been limited to just Municipal Historic Districts, but that

HARB Meeting Minutes February 6, 2023

they had been selected from properties within all three types of districts. He reiterated that the City needed to ensure that actions were

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the issue only applied to the residency requirement for Board members from the general public; Mr. Grover confirmed that was the case. He stated that the intent was to have Board members voting on issues that would also apply to themselves, so that they weren't voting on issues without having a stake in the outcome.

Ms. Rucker asked a question that was inaudible; Mr. Grover reiterated that there were three different types of districts as outlined on the City's Zoning Map. Ms. Rucker asked whether the Eligible Historic Districts were all in the Uptown neighborhood; Mr. Grover confirmed that there was at least one in Uptown and one in Bellevue Park. Ms. Rucker stated that they hadn't been granted formal status. Mr. Knight noted that Eligible Historic Districts were a PHMC-regulated district.

Ms. Rucker stated that Eligible Historic Districts had not chosen to be regulated by the historic district standards and guidelines. Mr. Grover confirmed that was the case, but noted that the issue of eligibility was a separate issue. He noted that the primary issue was whether all three types of districts were included in PHMC's official map based upon language in the Ordinance. Mr. Grover noted that there was a candidate interested in serving on the Board who was located in an Eligible Historic District, and thus the questions was relevant to immediate issues.

Mr. Grover reiterated that the discussion on by-law revisions might be subject to PHMC's purview. Mrs. Gribble asked whether City Council could modify the Ordinance; Mr. Grover noted that they might be able to modify the Ordinance. He concurred that the enabling Ordinance did need to be modified and noted that it had last been updated in 1985. Mr. Knight stated that the City hoped to have a determination by the March 6th meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: 8:17 PM

Ms. Rucker moved, and Ms. Bennett seconded the motion, to adjourn. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).