

## **MINUTES**

### **HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD REGULAR MEETING**

**May 1, 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

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Camille Bennett  
Kent Hurst

**STAFF PRESENT:** Geoffrey Knight, Planning Director  
Neil Grover, City Solicitor  
Emily Farren, Assistant City Solicitor

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

**CALL TO ORDER: 6:03 PM**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Prior to the vote on the March 6<sup>th</sup> meeting minutes, Mrs. Gribble noted that her husband worked at the architectural firm involved in two of the projects to be heard at the current meeting, and thus she would be recusing herself from those cases; she noted that despite here recusal, the Board still had a quorum and thus could take action on those cases. Mr. Grover noted that in a situation in which the Board had the minimum needed to have a quorum, a majority of the members present would need to adopt a resolution and thus the other three members would need to vote to approve a project.

Mrs. Tennis moved, and Mr. Henry seconded the motion, to Approve the minutes from the March 6, 2023 meeting without corrections. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (4-0).

#### **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 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”).

The Applicants provided the Board with presentation materials.

## **HARB Meeting Minutes**

### **May 1, 2023**

Mrs. Gribble asked Planning Bureau staff whether they wanted to re-read the case report for the project; Mr. Knight noted that he had not brought the case file for the project to the meeting since the case had been reviewed at several previous meetings. He stated that the Applicants had recently contacted him to revise the proposal to include a wood window for the first floor and fiberglass windows for the second floor; he noted that because a wooden, one-over-one window would be an in-kind replacement, that aspect of the project could be administratively approved and thus would not require HARB approval.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicants how many total windows would be removed; they confirmed that they would be replacing three windows in total as part of the project.

Mrs. Gribble noted that the Applicants had provided documentation regarding the alternative material proposed for the second-floor windows, but that the first-floor window would not utilize the same product. The Applicants confirmed that the manufacturer was not able to recreate the first-floor window in the same size, and thus they were revising the project to utilize a wooden window. They confirmed that the project proposed to replace one-over-one wooden windows on the second floor with one-over-one windows with wooden interiors clad in fiberglass exteriors which were manufactured by Marvin. They noted that the primary issue discussed during previous reviews was the paintability of the product.

The Applicants noted that the revised product was a window insert, and thus the existing window sills and trim would be retained and painted bronze to match the color palette of the building and the manufactured color of the fiberglass. The Applicants confirmed that the fiberglass material was fully paintable by the property owner in the same manner as a regular wooden window. They noted that the proposed windows would have the same profile as historic wooden windows with thinner rails and a lower sight line than comparable vinyl windows.

The Applicants provided a cut-section sample of the window for close inspection by the Board members, and also described the existing conditions of the windows as illustrated in photos provided to the Board. They noted that the windows were energy-efficient and insulation with argon glass between the panes. The Applicants stated that they were happy to address any questions or comments the Board members may have.

Mrs. Gribble noted that she was not in attendance at the April 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting during which the Board discussed alternative window products and considerations; she asked whether those were applicable to the current proposal.

Mrs. Tennis noted that one of the primary talking points was whether the replacement windows maintained the same overall window size and profile as the existing window. The Applicants stated that the replacement windows were not the exact dimensions of the existing windows, but that they were comparable. They reiterated that they were not replacing the wooden trim around the windows. Mrs. Tennis asked whether the same size and profile considerations applied to the proposed wooden window for the first floor; the Applicants confirmed that the manufacturing process was slightly different due to it being a different material, and that the sash would need to be slightly thicker because of the additional weight it would carry due to the size of the window

## **HARB Meeting Minutes**

### **May 1, 2023**

and the opening. They confirmed that it would be approximately half an inch thicker. Mrs. Tennis asked if they knew the difference in size between the existing and proposed sashes; the Applicants stated that they did not have that information on the exact measurements readily available. They noted that some of the window packet would sit behind the framing materials.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether any of the Board members had concerns about the proposed fiberglass material. She referenced the summary points from the previous meeting's discussion provided by Mr. Henry, noting the primary concerns including: retaining the historic appearance of the window, the size of the opening, the sash profile, and where the window sat within an opening, the size of the glass panes. The Applicants confirmed that they did not have exact measurements for each of those issues, but confirmed that their product generally matched historic window specifications and were used as appropriate.

Mrs. Gribble noted that another issue discussed at the previous meeting was window glazing, and asked how it would be addressed in the fiberglass windows. The Applicants confirmed that there was a bevel around the sashes which would match the general appearance of glazing on historic windows. They confirmed that they would not be utilizing simulated divided lite muntins.

The Applicants reiterated that documentation they submitted at the current meeting confirmed that the product was "100% paintable without impacting the protection or properties of the Ultrex [material]." They also noted that the manufacturer had renamed the product from "Integrity" to "Elevate," but confirmed that they were the same material. The Applicants noted that the product guide contained simple steps for the homeowner to paint the material.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the intention was to leave the existing sills and headers in place and paint them. The Applicants confirmed that was the case and noted that some framing elements were currently wrapped, and that this would be removed as part of the project; they asked whether the Board was concerned about that specifically. Mrs. Tennis noted that sometimes wrapping concealed rotted wood. The Applicants confirmed that the headers and sills, and any wrapping, would not be disturbed as part of the window installation process.

Mrs. Tennis noted that if the header was rotted, they'd have to replace it with a new one, likely comprised of metal; the Applicants stated that the headers and sills were rotted. Mrs. Tennis stated that it might not be possible to tell until the wrapping was removed. The Applicants confirmed that the headers and sills were wood, but stated wouldn't rot because they were installed against the brick window opening. They noted that preliminary inspections did not show any signs of rotting or damage. The Applicants reiterated that the headers and sills would not be disturbed, but that if any rot or damage was identified, it would be replaced with in-kind materials.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether any of the Board members had concerns about the project based on the various criteria discussed at the April HARB meeting. Mrs. Tennis reiterated her concerns about the headers and wrapping and asked whether the window would be appropriate if the material surfaces did not match and appeared different from the street. The Applicants confirmed that all of the windows had wrapping, so there would not be concerns about different header and sill materials. Mrs. Gribble noted the Applicant had confirmed that any necessary repairs would be in-kind and thus not subject to HARB review. Mrs. Tennis stated that she wasn't overly

## **HARB Meeting Minutes**

### **May 1, 2023**

concerned if the Board felt comfortable moving forward; the Applicants concurred that the wrapped headers and sills were not original, but noted that the condition existed prior to being purchased by the current owner.

Mrs. Gribble outlined the revised proposal, including the in-kind replacement of the existing one-over-one wooden window on the first floor and the replacement of the one-over-one wooden windows on the second floor with fiberglass (Elevate) windows in the same configuration. She noted that there were no other concerns expressed by the Board and asked whether any of the members wanted to make a motion.

Mr. Henry moved, and Ms. Rucker seconded the motion, to Approve the application. The motion was adopted by a majority vote (3-1).

### **NEW BUSINESS:**

- 1. 1126 North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, filed by David Butcher with WCI Partners, LP, to make alterations to various existing entrances on the side elevation of the building, including replacing existing solid steel doors with wooden doors featuring half-view panes; replacing inoperable or redundant doors in the first-floor units with wooden, paneled infill; and replacing existing doors accessible from the fire escapes on the side and rear elevations with a one-over-one window. The Applicant will also be removing the small concrete stoops in the public right-of-way in front of any doors being infilled.**

The case was represented by David Butcher with WCI Partners, LP (the property owner), 1900 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102; and Kathryn Sterner with By Design Consultants (the project architect), 1950 Market Street, Camp Hill, PA 17011 (aka “the Applicants”).

Mrs. Gribble reminded the Board that she was recusing herself due to her husband’s position with the project architect, and handed her duties to Mrs. Tennis as the Acting Chair.

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

Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicants whether they wanted to provide additional information to the Planning Bureau’s case report. They noted that they wanted to include an existing amendment to the proposal; specifically, they noted that they were originally proposing to replace the solid, paneled steel doors with wooden doors featuring a half-view pane, but that they wanted to revise the proposal to use half-view steel doors. They noted that this would be an in-kind replacement with respect to materiality.

Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicants to clarify which doors they were describing. The Applicants referenced the elevation plan drawings they had provided to the Board members and discussed proposals for the various doors in an east-to-west order. They stated that the door nearest to the fire escape and North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street would remain the same. The Applicants stated that the next door in had been inoperable for years, and that they were proposing to installed a wooden panel that would simulated a full-view wooden door.

## **HARB Meeting Minutes**

### **May 1, 2023**

Mrs. Tennis requested clarification on which doors would be remained and which would be replaced, as well as the proposed replacement materials and design. The Applicants noted that there were three existing types of doors: operable entry doors, those that appeared to be operable doors which had been secured shut, and paneled steel doors which were not original to the structure. The Applicants noted that the doors which were currently inoperable would be replaced with wooden panels that had a similar appearance to the wooden doors with full-view panes.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the Applicants were proposing any alterations to the front elevation of the building; the Applicants stated that the work around the main entrance was not included in the current application. Mr. Knight confirmed that the rehabilitation work on the main entrance of the front elevation was in-kind replacement; he noted that once the Applicants had begun removing aspects of the front façade, they determined that more extensive structural work was necessary, but that they would be recreating the former appearance once that was complete. Mrs. Tennis stated that she felt it was important to know what the intention was for that area because it was related to the work on the side of the building.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there were any proposed changes to the existing windows along the side elevation. The Applicants stated that a window on the second floor of the fire escape had been replaced with a non-historic access door, and noted that they were intending on re-installing a one-over-one wooden window.

Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicants to confirm that none of the existing doors or windows would change in size, scale, or configuration; they confirmed that was the case. She asked whether the glass storefront windows on the side elevation would remain or be replaced; the Applicants confirmed that they would not be replaced as part of the project. Mr. Knight noted that while there were six entrance doors on the side of the building, there were only two units, and thus that one of the two doors accessing each unit would be replaced with a wooden panel that simulated a door to provide more security for future residents.

Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicants to clarify which doors were included in the project revision referenced previously noted at the beginning of the project review. The Applicants again referred to the elevation plan drawings they had provided to the Board members. They confirmed that the door closet to the fire escape would remain and then explained which “doors” were inoperable and would be replaced with wooden raised-panel infills, and which were existing functional steel doors that would be replaced with half-view steel doors. Mrs. Tennis asked how many of the wooden doors would be replaced with steel doors; the Applicants confirmed that any proposed steel doors would replace existing steel doors.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the opening under the fire escape on the rear elevation was a door; the Applicants confirmed that it was currently infilled with a wooden panel and that they would not be changing that as part of the project.

Mrs. Tennis noted that the project proposed the removal of the concrete stoops at some entrances. The Applicants noted that they were small stoops in front of inoperable doors and confirmed that the stoops would remain in front of the functional entrances; they stated that they hoped to make the building more “rational.”

## **HARB Meeting Minutes**

### **May 1, 2023**

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there were any questions from the other Board members. There were none.

Mrs. Tennis asked if the Applicants had anything else to add to their presentation; they stated that they did not.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the steel doors would be painted; the Applicants confirmed that they would be.

Ms. Rucker moved, and Mr. Henry seconded the motion, to Approve the application. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (3-0-1; Mrs. Gribble recused herself). Mr. Grover clarified that the project was approved with the revisions that the Applicants had noted at the beginning of the discussion and Ms. Rucker confirmed that was accurate.

#### **2. 1200 North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street, filed by David Butcher with WCI Partners, LP, to replace the solid steel entrance door on the side with a ¾-lite steel door, and to infill the previously-paneled transom with brick. This is an after-the-fact installation.**

The case was represented by David Butcher with WCI Partners, LP (the property owner), 1900 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102 (aka “the Applicant”).

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

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant whether they wanted to provide additional information on the proposal. The Applicant stated that he did not.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there were any questions or comments from the other Board members. Mrs. Tennis noted that she had conducted a site visit and observed some questionable patchwork repairs along the underside of the wooden cornice, and stated that she felt it should be done better. She also noted that there appeared to be rotting window headers and sills and shifting masonry around some of the fenestration openings; she noted that addressing those aspects may be costly, but she felt it was necessary. Mrs. Tennis noted that the infill being addressed the project looked as though it occurred a while ago, and that it was a shame those elements had been lost; she stated that she felt it would be a missed opportunity if those aspects were not addressed.

Mrs. Gribble noted that the application was limited to the replacement of the entrance door, the replacement of the transom, and the infill of a wooden paneled area with brick. Mr. Knight confirmed that was the case. Mrs. Gribble stated that she agreed with Mrs. Tennis, but that those issues weren’t within the purview of the Board. Mrs. Tennis concurred, but expressed concern that if they were not addressed, they might get worse over time.

Mrs. Gribble noted that the window sills, headers, and frames had been painted and asked whether they had been inspected; the Applicant stated that their contractors would test those to determine the shape they were in and noted that the building had been in poor shape when they purchased it

## **HARB Meeting Minutes**

### **May 1, 2023**

recently. Mrs. Tennis noted that she had been in the building previously and had seen deterioration from the inside.

Ms. Rucker asked whether the building still featured apartments; the Applicant confirmed that there were apartments on the upper floors.

Mrs. Gribble asked Planning Bureau staff to incorporate Mrs. Tennis' comments into the meeting minutes.

Ms. Rucker moved, and Mr. Henry seconded the motion, to Approve the application. The motion was adopted by a majority vote (3-1).

### **3. 305 Herr Street, filed by Robert Daniels, to replace existing windows on-site with vinyl-clad windows; to install new Fibrex casement windows on the western elevation; to replace wooden door with half-lite pane with a solid panel; and to construct a new deck on the roof of the two-story rear addition. This is an after-the-fact installation.**

The case was represented by Robert Daniels (the property owner), 3628 North 6<sup>th</sup> Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102; and Bret Peters (the project architect), 3001 North 2<sup>nd</sup> Street, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka "the Applicants").

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the case report, and noted that per discussions with the contractor, the windows were not clad in vinyl and were instead Fibrex, recommending the request be Approved with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant will ensure that all new wooden elements are painted or stained upon installation.
2. Any work on the roof and/or dormers must utilize in-kind replacements of existing materials, including the real slate shingles on the mansard roof and dormer cheeks.
3. The Applicant must coordinate with the Codes Bureau on the code-compliance of the windows on the western elevation; if larger windows are required, the Applicant will install one-over-one windows of the same material as those installed.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicants whether they wanted to provide additional information on the proposal. The property owner stated that when he purchased the property, it was derelict and had been abandoned for several years; he noted that the front elevation had aluminum siding, which was removed and replaced with original wooden clapboard siding [note: this came from the side of the building]. He noted that one of the previous contractors had recreated historic wooden dentils and brackets for the cornice. The property owner noted that he had endeavored to recreate the original appearance of the property.

The Applicants stated that the side elevation was clad in insulbrick when it was originally purchased; they noted that they attempted to rehabilitate the underlying clapboard siding on the side elevation, but that it was too deteriorated to do so. They stated that they had previously coordinated with the City to replace the insulbrick siding with stucco, and had received approval to do so.

## HARB Meeting Minutes

### May 1, 2023

Ms. Rucker asked whether the windows had already been replaced when the home was purchased; the Applicants noted that there were no windows on the side façade originally because it had previously been a partition wall shared with a structure that had been demolished. Ms. Rucker clarified that she was referring to the windows replaced on the front and rear elevations; the Applicants confirmed that all the windows on the front, except for the first-floor window, had been replaced previously. Ms. Rucker asked whether the project would feature sliding doors onto the rear porch; the Applicants confirmed that they were proposing to install French doors.

Ms. Rucker noted that the rooftop deck had already been constructed; the Applicants confirmed that was the case and stated that the project had been under construction for years. Ms. Rucker asked whether the current property owner had also installed the windows on the side façade; he confirmed that his contractors had done so.

The Applicants stated that they had received administrative approval for some aspects of the work that had been completed, noting that plans which included the rooftop deck had been submitted to the City in 2016. Mr. Knight confirmed that a Building Permit had been submitted to the City in 2016, when a former HARB Board member, Art Emerick, had been the Deputy Codes Administrator, but noted that he had only grant approval for interior work and made a notation on the permit that any exterior alterations required HARB approval. Mr. Knight noted that the project had progressed in fits and starts through various contractors over the years, and that it was likely that a more recent contractor assumed they had approval for all the work when the permit had been renewed, although that was not the case.

Mrs. Gribble referenced the elevation plans submitted by the Applicants and asked them to walk the Board members through various aspects of the project. She noted that the applicable elements on the side included the stucco finish, installation of windows, and rooftop deck; Ms. Rucker asked whether the Board was just deciding whether to approve the proposed doors, noting that the other aspects had been completed. Mrs. Gribble confirmed that it was an after-the-fact application, so the work had already been completed.

Ms. Rucker asked what aspects of the project the Board was being asked to approve, and whether it just involved the front and rear doors; Mr. Knight stated that every aspect of the project visible from the street was under their purview. Mrs. Gribble agreed that all aspects of the exterior work should be subject to their resolution, and Mr. Knight reiterated that *any* exterior alteration was subject to the Board's purview and they could instruct the Applicants to remove or replace any inappropriate alterations since they had never been approved in the past. He confirmed that the Planning Bureau had administratively approved the stucco replacement of the insulation in 2016, so that was the only aspect not subject to the Board's review.

Mr. Grover asked whether the Planning Bureau had records on file regarding previous exterior alterations that were made to the property around 2016; Mr. Knight confirmed that every aspect of the project he had outlined in the project description portion of the case report was subject to the Board's review.

Mrs. Gribble referenced the side elevation plan submitted by the Applicants, reiterating that the stucco had already been approved, and noting that there were seven awning windows and a single



## **HARB Meeting Minutes**

### **May 1, 2023**

double-hung window on that façade. Mr. Henry asked how the Applicants determined the size of the awning windows. They stated that they were only intended to bring light into the interior space; Mr. Henry noted that the windows within the bathroom needed to have a total area of at least three square feet per the building code, and that the installed windows were only two-and-a-half square feet; he noted that the windows would also have to open unless they had mechanical ventilation. Mr. Henry also noted that there were regulations regarding the minimum window area to floor area for each room as well, and that he wasn't sure if the project met those as well. Mr. Grover asked whether those regulations would have been in place at the time the work was done.

Mrs. Gribble stated that the Board should keep in mind the building code requirements, but that ultimately their actions should be based on the criteria they had been discussing for doors and windows. She noted that while the Board had previously approved the Fibrex material, the awning windows were not replacing existing ones as they were new additions to what had previously been a partition wall, and thus the Planning Bureau was recommending approval for that aspect of the project. Mr. Knight confirmed that was the case and noted that he had included Condition #3 because he wasn't sure whether the installed windows were sufficient to meet the code requirements and, if they were not, they would need to be replaced. Mr. Henry confirmed that they were not required to install egress windows.

Mr. Knight referenced the Board's consideration of whether the windows were appropriate, and stated that his approach to the awning windows was that the wall was not exposed in the past and thus it was more of an issue of code compliance. Mrs. Gribble noted that the windows could be considered "new construction" and thus held to the standards that covered such projects; she stated that she felt it was appropriate to consider the rhythm and materiality of the windows.

Mrs. Tennis noted that their discussion at the April HARB meeting touched on how projects were context-specific and noted that the other building bordering the parking lot had a masonry façade. The Applicants stated that there was a mural on the building; Mr. Knight clarified that it was located on the other side of the building. Mrs. Tennis stated that she did not feel the stucco façade was appropriate within the context of the neighborhood. Mr. Knight confirmed that the other side of the adjacent structure was stucco and featured a mural; he also reminded the Board that the façade previously featured insulbrick and that the Applicants could have theoretically replaced that with asphalt shingles. He stated that he didn't feel as though that would have been appropriate for the neighborhood and thus they had approved the use of stucco as an alternative façade treatment. The Applicant stated that they had engaged Sprocket Mural Works to install a mural on the side of the building.

Mrs. Gribble stated that she wanted to continue discussing whether the size, shape, and function of the awning windows was appropriate, as well as the rooftop deck; she noted that Planning Bureau staff had recommended any wooden elements be painted or stained. Mr. Knight noted that the condition was a consistent inclusion in their case reports and that the intention was to ensure that projects did not weather poorly and maintained a good appearance over time. Mrs. Gribble asked whether the deck featured Trex product; Mr. Knight confirmed that the deck floor was Trex but that the railings were wood.

## **HARB Meeting Minutes**

### **May 1, 2023**

Mrs. Gribble noted that railings featured wooden banisters with straight pickets and capped posts. She asked whether the other Board members had comments on the design of the porch elements. Mrs. Tennis stated that she didn't have an issue with the design and noted that it replicated the appearance of the deck at a nearby building (1507 North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street).

Mrs. Gribble addressed the front façade of the property, noting that each of the windows featured a one-over-one pane configuration and that they were constructed of Fibrex material.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether any of the roofing was being replaced. Ms. Rucker stated that there was no roofing work being proposed, and she asked whether the transom over the main entrance was being removed. Mrs. Gribble noted that the drawings provided by Applicant confirmed that the transom would be replaced in-kind. She stated that the work addressing the main entrance would be a substantial improvement on the existing conditions.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether any roofing work was being proposed, noting call-outs on the elevation plan set. Mr. Knight noted that the plans indicated the project would rehabilitate the existing roof, fascia, and dormers; he noted that Condition #2 was included to ensure that work represented in-situ repair or in-kind replacement.

Mrs. Tennis noted that the proposed one-over-one windows differed from the adjacent property (307 Herr Street) which featured two-over-two windows and inquired as to the pane configuration of the other windows on the block. Mrs. Gribble asked whether two-over-two windows were typical in the neighborhood; Mr. Knight stated that he wasn't sure about the other properties, but confirmed that the existing door and windows on the front elevation were there as far back as 2007 per Google Streets View images. The Applicants stated that prior to about 1900, oriel windows were illegal and that when the restriction was lifted, many homeowners added them to their properties; they stated that at that time, homeowners would also replace other windows within their buildings as well and thus the one-over-one windows might have been installed at that time.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the Applicant's historical reference addressed the concerns about the pane configuration of the windows. Mrs. Tennis stated that her primary concern was how thin the proposed windows appeared to be compared to the two-over-two windows and noted that the previous month's discussion regarding windows outlined a greater focus on how the overall proposal addressed the historic character of the building and the neighborhood context.

Mr. Knight concurred with Mrs. Tennis, but also noted that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards recommended against the use of conjectural features and supported the retention of non-original elements which had gained historic value in their own right; he noted that if the Applicant's recitation of architectural history were correct, then it may be more appropriate to require the use of one-over-one windows. He stated that the oriel window was not original to the property, noting that the inclusion of the window required the removal of the pediment that used to be above the entryway.

Mrs. Gribble referenced the changes to the rear elevation, noting that the Applicants were proposing to use both double-hung and fixed windows with hoppers. Mr. Knight stated that the rear of the property was not visible from the public right-of-way, even though it was included in

## **HARB Meeting Minutes**

### **May 1, 2023**

the elevation plan set, and that it was obscured from view from James Street by the adjacent building. Ms. Rucker concurred. Mrs. Gribble asked why the rooftop deck was being reviewed if the rear of the property was not visible from a public right-of-way; Mr. Knight noted that the deck was visible from North 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.

Mrs. Gribble re-read the conditions and asked whether the Applicants had any issues with them; they stated that they did not.

Mr. Henry asked whether the existing stucco treatment on the façade was the final treatment; the Applicants confirmed that it was and noted that it had been applied about four or five years ago. Mr. Henry asked the Planning Bureau staff to confirm that was accurate and Mr. Knight confirmed that it was.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the Board members had issues or concerns about the windows on the western elevation; Mrs. Tennis noted that Mr. Henry had previously stated that the existing windows did not meet the code requirements. Mrs. Gribble asked if there were any concerns about the size, function, or location of the windows on the western elevation.

Mrs. Gribble noted that the project was proposing to replace an existing inappropriate door with a half-view pane with a solid wooden door; the Applicants confirmed that was the case. Mr. Knight confirmed the proposed door was constructed of a Medium-Density Fiberboard, which was a wood-based product and similar to Fibrex. He reiterated that the existing door was clearly not original or historically-appropriate.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Board members if there were any concerns about the proposed material or style of the entry door and transom; there were none.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Board members if there were any concerns about the proposed material or style of the deck; 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).

### **OTHER BUSINESS:**

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there were any additional issues to discuss. Mr. Knight stated that none were included on the agenda and noted that the Law Bureau was researching issues related to the by-laws which had been discussed at previous meetings

Mr. Knight noted that if the Board had specific questions about the windows, he could forward those to Mr. Grumbine for his input or do background research for discussion at a future meeting.

### **ADJOURNMENT: 7:23 PM**

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