

MINUTES

HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD RESCHEDULED MEETING

October 18, 2023

**THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. CITY GOVERNMENT CENTER
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kali Tennis, Vice Chair
Bruce Henry, Deputy Codes Administrator
April Rucker (arrived at 6:04 PM)
Kent Hurst

MEMBERS ABSENT: Trina Gribble, Chair
Camille Bennett

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

OTHERS PRESENT: See Sign-In Sheet

CALL TO ORDER: 6:04 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Hurst moved, and Mr. Henry seconded the motion, to approve the minutes from the September 11, 2023 meeting without corrections. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (4-0).

OLD BUSINESS: N/A

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. 1718 Green Street, filed by Richard & Hilary Deighan, to replace the second- and third-floor windows on the front elevation with fiberglass-clad (Ultrex) wood windows.**

The case was represented by Hilary & Richard Deighan (the property owners), 1718 Green Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102; 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 project only proposes to replace the second- and third-floor windows on the front elevation, which are out of the “touch zone;” the Board utilized this justification in approving an alternative product (Enduraclad) at the adjacent property.
2. The project proposes the use of a material (Ultrex) which the Board has recently reviewed and authorized in conditions similar to the current proposal (i.e., only on the upper floors).
3. Upon researching the proposed material, it appears to be paintable without voiding the warranty by utilizing a common, readily-purchased product.

HARB Meeting Minutes

October 18, 2023

Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicants whether they wanted to provide additional information regarding the proposal. The Applicants stated that the project involved window inserts and thus the existing woodwork and trim around the exterior of the sashes would remain; they noted that the windows would be painted by the homeowner. They noted that the product was the same as approved by the Board during a previous project review. They stated that the trim lines would be similar to an historic wood window.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there were any questions or comments from the Board.

Ms. Rucker asked the Applicants to confirm that the material was paintable without voiding the warranty and without requiring special treatments; the Applicants confirmed that they were.

Mrs. Tennis asked what color the Applicants intended to paint the windows; they stated that they intended to paint them bronze. Mrs. Tennis asked whether the window trim would be painted and the Applicants confirmed that they had already painted it. The Applicants noted that the first-floor window had already been replaced in-kind with a wooden window and that it would be painted the same color as the proposed windows.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there were any questions or comments from the public; 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).

- 2. 2016 Green Street, filed by Ron & Julia Tilley, to replace the second-floor windows on the front elevation with fiberglass-clad (Ultrex) wood windows and to replace the wood trim with Boral trim; to replace the first- and second-floor windows on the side and rear elevations with fiberglass-clad (Ultrex) wood windows; to replace all wood trim with Boral trim on all elevations; and to replace the front and rear doors with fiberglass doors.**

The case was represented by Ron Tilley II & Julia Tilley (the property owner), 2016 Green Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102; 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 Applicant will not utilize the proposed fiberglass windows for replacements on the first floor of the side elevation; previous approval for use of the proposed product (Marvin Elevate windows) was predicated upon the installation location being out of the “touch zone.”
2. The Applicant will not utilize the proposed Boral product for the trim around any of the windows, and will instead repair the existing wooden window trim or replace in-kind with wooden trim.
3. The Applicant will utilize paneled wooden doors for the front and rear entrances.
4. The project will be considered a “test case” in which approval of an alternative material does not authorize its use elsewhere and does not establish a precedent for future HARB reviews.

HARB Meeting Minutes

October 18, 2023

Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicants whether they wanted to provide additional information regarding the proposal. They noted the condition limiting the use of the proposed window to the upper floors, and referenced a previous HARB decision regarding the product in which first-floor replacement windows were not proposed due to the size of the windows; they stated that they were not aware that the location of the windows could be a determining factor in their approval. The Applicants stated that they would like to use the same product throughout the house and that the product, when painted, would have the same appearance as painted wood windows.

They asked the Board to approve the use of the proposed windows for all the first-floor windows along the side elevation; they noted that the first-floor window on the front elevation would be replaced with wood because it was too large to be manufactured in the proposed Ultrex material. The Applicants stated that they would be full-frame replacements because the existing windows and frames were deteriorated and stated that the current windows were not original to the structure and that modern wooden windows been installed in the 1980s. They stated that the proposed product would match the existing wooden windows in various features including pane size and profile.

The Applicants stated that the project involved three components, including the replacement of the windows, the trim around the windows, and the two entry doors. They stated that the existing wooden trim was failing and had been replaced in the 1980s with the windows; they noted that the proposed replacement material was a fly ash composite product called Boral which included a resin component similar to other alternative materials which had been approved by the Board. They Applicants approached the Board members with samples of the product.

Mrs. Tennis stated that she wanted to discuss each condition separately and asked the Applicants if they had any other information to add regarding the project. They discussed the Boral trim installation and noted that the brick and concrete elements of the windows would be retained and repaired as needed, but reiterated that the windows would be full-frame replacements. They stated the window sills would also use the Boral product in the same dimensions.

Mrs. Tennis asked the Board members whether they had any questions regarding Condition #1 and stated that she felt the Applicants request was reasonable as-is. She stated that it was an end unit and thanked them for investing in the property, and thus felt it was reasonable to use the same windows throughout the property. Mr. Hurst concurred and stated that he felt it would look weird if different windows were used; he stated that approval of the windows for the first floor would not establish a precedent for future requests. Mrs. Tennis stated that because the property was an end unit, the investment required of the property owner was greater than for other properties, and that she felt the request to use materials which would require less maintenance was reasonable.

Mrs. Tennis asked the Board members whether they had any questions regarding Condition #1. Mr. Henry asked if the large, first-floor window on the front would utilize the same Ultrex material; the Applicants confirmed that it would be replaced within a wooden window because an opening that large could not be replaced with the proposed material. Mr. Henry asked how far the first-floor windows on the side elevation were above the sidewalk level; the Applicants stated that it was approximately five feet. Mr. Henry asked whether the Boral material was paintable; the Applicants confirmed that it was.

HARB Meeting Minutes

October 18, 2023

Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicants to discuss the Boral product; they stated that it was brought to the market as a replacement for wooden elements and referenced documentation provided with the submission packet that outlined the material specifications. They stated that it was a dense product with a low expansion/contraction rate which made it more stable and resistant than wood. They stated that it would dent if struck and noted that because it had organic material it was not rot-proof but did resist rot and termites. The Applicants reiterated that the product was paintable without voiding the warranty and that the manufacturer expected the product to be painted; they noted that the trim would be painted to match the gunmetal gray color proposed for the replacement window units.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there were any questions or comments from the other Board members regarding the Boral product. Mr. Hurst noted that the sample provided by the Applicants was crumbling and eroding in his hands and asked about the product's resiliency to damage; they stated that the product could be dented. Mr. Hurst asked if the product could be repaired with materials similar to wood putties and fill; the Applicants confirmed that it could. Mr. Hurst asked if painting the product addressed the wearing issues and the Applicants confirmed that was correct and noted that not painting the product would not void the warranty, although they reiterated that painting it would increase the durability.

Ms. Rucker inquired as to how long the product had been manufactured or in use in the industry; Ms. Connor stated that her company had been utilizing the product for at least ten years. She noted that the product was considered a "greener" alternative to other materials such as vinyl.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the Boral product could be cut or mitered in the field; the Applicants confirmed that the product could be treated similarly to wood and milled or worked in a similar manner. Mr. Henry inquired about the expansion/contraction coefficient of the material compared to pressure-treated lumber. They stated that while they could not be sure, they presumed it was a lesser number due to the presence of resin within the product.

The Applicants asked whether the product had previously been approved by the Board; Mr. Knight stated that he was not aware of any prior reviews and that this was the first time he had reviewed use of the product.

Mrs. Tennis referenced Condition #3 in the case report regarding the replacement of the existing wooden doors with fiberglass doors; the Applicants provided the Board members with additional information on the proposed doors and noted that they would utilize the same six-paneled design in a wood grain finish. They stated that they wanted the performance, durability, and longevity of a fiberglass door over a wooden door. The Applicants noted that they were reinstall simple fiberglass transoms above the doors, and that the color would be similar to the color palette used for the rest of the home; they stated that the existing doors were modern wooden doors built into the existing frame.

Mr. Hurst asked whether the project would replace the transom glass; the Applicants confirmed that was the case and noted that when they replaced doors, they usually replaced all elements within the masonry opening. Mrs. Tennis asked whether the fiberglass transom and six-paneled

HARB Meeting Minutes

October 18, 2023

door would be a single unit and whether this configuration would be used for both the front and rear doors; the Applicants confirmed that was the case.

Mr. Hurst asked whether the front door had been damaged by weathering due to its location. The Applicants stated that the current door was not a good quality, so it was not performing well, but did note that it was covered by a storm door; they noted that the rear door was more exposed to the elements and was in worse shape. The Applicants stated that the adjacent property also featured a fiberglass door. Mr. Hurst asked whether the proposed door was paintable; the Applicants confirmed that it could be painted without voiding the warranty.

Mrs. Tennis noted that the Board was discussing the various conditions in the Planning Bureau's case report, and informed the Applicants that they might vote without conditions, with some conditions, or retaining all the conditions. She stated that the Board seemed to feel that all the proposed conditions could be removed and asked whether anyone wanted to further discuss the conditions. Mr. Hurst stated that he wanted to discuss Condition #4 and noted that each of the projects should be considered individually and treated on a case-by-case basis, while still recognizing cases for similar proposals that had previously been considered. He stated that the proposed window and door replacements felt appropriate.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether Mr. Hurst was stating that any review was property specific and context specific; he confirmed that was the case. Mr. Knight asked the Board to clarify in which instances a fiberglass door *would not* be appropriate, noting that it sounded as though the Board was supportive of such replacements without exceptions; Mr. Hurst stated that there were fiberglass doors that were well-made and those that were not. Mrs. Tennis referenced a former case in which fiberglass door was necessary because there was no ability to match the original handmade wooden doors; Mr. Knight asked which property or case she was referencing and she stated that she didn't remember what it was. She stated that the proposal in that case was an inappropriate infill design of the existing door opening and stated that the current proposal would match the existing entryway in appearance and would be weathertight. The Applicants noted that they were proposing Boral trim unless the Board required them to use wood, in which case they were considering the use of mahogany trim.

Mrs. Tennis stated that the Board should vote on the conditions one-by-one; she asked if there was a motion to remove Condition #1. Mr. Hurst moved to remove Condition #1; Mrs. Tennis noted that this would allow the Applicant to use the same replacements for all the windows and asked whether a Board member wanted to second the motion but no Board member seconded the motion. Mrs. Tennis asked why the other Board members did not want to second the motion; Ms. Rucker stated that she did not feel the proposed windows were appropriate in the touch zone. Mrs. Tennis asked what she wanted instead; Ms. Rucker stated that the Applicant could use wooden windows for the first floor. The Applicants confirmed that their alternative would be to use wooden windows on the first floor, but asked Ms. Rucker whether there was a standing requirement or regulation that required first-floor windows; she confirmed that there were. Mrs. Tennis stated that the Design Guidelines did not prescribe a specific product and that determinations were to be context specific; she stated that it was her opinion that having two different products on the same building elevation would not make sense.

HARB Meeting Minutes

October 18, 2023

Ms. Rucker noted that in a previous project, approval was granted only for replacement of the windows on the upper floors; the Applicant stated that that was because they could not make the larger windows of the first floor using the Ultrex product. Mrs. Tennis stated that the previous project was different because it was a different property and there was a covered porch which visually separated the first and second floors; she stated that Ms. Rucker was proposing to have two different windows on a single elevation.

Mr. Knight noted that the Applicant had testified that their window product would replicate the appearance of an historic wooden window, and that it seemed disingenuous to then argue that the windows would actually appear so different that it would be obvious they were not the same. The Applicants acknowledged that there would be differences in appearances. They asked whether Fibrex windows were prohibited from being used on first floors; Mr. Knight stated that they had no such restriction but also that the product was only administratively approved over a timeline of several years during which the windows were observed for their ability to retain paint and withstand weathering.

He noted that former Board members had granted the material administrative approval status and noted that the material was specifically included in the Historic District Design Guidelines. The Applicant asked whether the initial installations of that product were prohibited from installation on the first floors of properties; Mr. Knight stated that he could not recall back that far, but noted that those projects were slowly phased in over time. The Applicants stated that they felt they should not have to be held to a different standard. Mrs. Tennis stated that during Frank Grumbine's presentation in April 2023, he stated that the Board should not be authorizing specific products. Mr. Knight noted that administrative approval was not limited to a specific product and was granted to any wood composite material.

Mr. Tilley stated that they were requesting to be treated as a "test case" and that because they were a corner lot, it would cost a significant amount of money to replace the windows, so they wanted to install windows that would reduce maintenance for themselves and future property owners.

Mrs. Tennis noted that there was a motion on the floor to removed Condition #1, and seconded the motion. She asked if there were any more questions from the Board members; Ms. Farren stated that since there was a motion on the floor, they should proceed to take a vote on it. The motion was adopted by a majority vote (3-1).

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there were any other comments on Condition #2. The Applicants asked for confirmation that it related to the use of the Boral material; Mrs. Tennis confirmed that it was and asked whether they had the case report. The Applicants stated that they did not. Mr. Knight noted that all of the case documentation was available to the public on the Planning Bureau's website and had been posted there since October 2nd. He also noted that the agenda letter which was sent to all applicants confirmed that the documentation was available on the website.

Mr. Knight noted that if the Board was considering granting "test case" approval for the Boral product, there were better options for such an allowance than an end unit which had many windows and on which the proposed material would thus be highly visible. He stated that a building in the

HARB Meeting Minutes

October 18, 2023

middle of a row would be a more appropriate place to grant such approvals. Mrs. Tennis stated that, in the interest of time, the Board should table the discussion of test cases for a future meeting.

Mrs. Tennis asked the Board for a motion regarding the removal of Condition #2. Mr. Hurst moved, and Mrs. Tennis seconded the motion, to remove Condition #2. The motion was adopted by a majority vote (3-1).

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there were any other comments on Condition #3. Mr. Knight stated that if the Board did choose to allow the use of the fiberglass doors, they should utilize a design that did not feature the wood grain. He noted that while the Planning Bureau had previously recommended that cementitious fiberboard feature wood grain to mimic the appearance of wood, the Historic District Design Guidelines recommend a flat finish that does not reference natural wood. Mr. Knight noted that the former Historic Preservation Specialist, Frank Grumbine, had included that in the guidelines and that the intention was to differentiate modern materials from historic materials, even among elements which otherwise featured the same design. The Applicants stated that that would be acceptable.

Mr. Hurst moved, and Mrs. Tennis seconded the motion, to remove Condition #3. The motion was adopted by a majority vote (3-1).

Mrs. Tennis asked the Board whether they wanted to remove Condition #4 that related to the consideration of the project as a “test case.” Mr. Henry stated that he felt that condition should be retained. Mr. Henry moved, and Mr. Hurst seconded the motion, to retain Condition #4. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (4-0).

The Applicants inquired as to what they needed to do to support Condition #4. Mr. Knight noted that there was no action for the Applicants to take; it only referenced precedents for future projects proposing the same materials.

3. 151 & 153 Sylvan Terrace, filed by Erica Rawls, to do a complete exterior renovation of the property, including a new building addition, removal of the front porch railings; replacing windows, doors, and siding on the rear addition; and constructing a rooftop deck on the rear addition.

The case was represented by Erica & Jesse Rawls (the property owners), 1003 Seemore Drive, Harrisburg, PA 17111 (aka “the Applicants”).

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

1. The Applicant will not utilize vinyl siding as cladding for the rear addition, as it is not an historically-appropriate material and would be out of context with all of the properties on the block; the Applicant should retain and repair the existing brick façade or utilize cementitious fiberboard siding if necessary.
2. The Applicant will not use aluminum or vinyl windows in either the existing structure or proposed addition; while wood or wood composite windows would be preferable for the

HARB Meeting Minutes

October 18, 2023

existing historic structure, the Bureau believes that fiberglass windows may also be appropriate in this context particularly if they are used in the proposed new addition.

3. The Applicant will not utilize vinyl doors for the front entry (composite doors would be acceptable), and the Planning Bureau would recommend that the doors use the same style and design (double doors with small panes) as those of the attached building which appear to be original given their prevalence on the block.
4. The Applicant will retain the existing posts, railings, brackets, and gingerbread of the front porch, or will recreate exact replicas of these elements, as they are some of the most conspicuous elements of the primary façade and match the porch elements of the attached structure.
5. The project will not use the proposed Fypon product for the cornice and mouldings as it is an historically-inappropriate material (polyurethane).
6. The Applicant will not paint the existing brick façade as indicated in the project renderings, unless they utilize an historically-appropriate product that allows the brick masonry to “breathe.”
7. The Applicant will replace the asphalt shingles on the mansard roof project with real slate shingles, which can be salvaged from the rear mansard roof.

Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicants whether they wanted to provide additional information regarding the proposal. They stated that the case report was a good summary of the overall proposal and noted that unapproved and inappropriate changes had been made to the property in the past; they noted that the property was condemned and that they were intending on renovating the building and reselling it.

Mrs. Tennis stated that the Board could review the projects conditions individually; she asked whether Condition #1 was acceptable to the Applicants or whether it was in conflict with their proposal. They stated that the prohibition against vinyl siding would impact the work on the rear of the structure; they noted that they were going to demolish and rebuild the rear portion of the structure so they needed to use vinyl siding with a faux wood grain for the “cost effectiveness” of the project. Mrs. Tennis asked if that were the portion with the rooftop deck; the Applicants confirmed that was the case.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether they wanted to provide any other justifications for the use of vinyl siding; the Applicants reiterated the cost effectiveness of the siding material and they stated that the siding would look like wood, that it would blend into the building, and that it would not be visible from the street. Mr. Henry noted that the property was an end unit, and thus the rear of the property would be visible from the street.

Mrs. Tennis asked which properties the Applicants owned; they confirmed they had purchased 151-155 Sylvan Terrace and were going to be consolidating the parcels into a single lot. They also stated that they were intending on two off-street installing parking on-site, although that had not been included as part of the original project submission. Mr. Knight noted that that aspect would need to be included in a separate application for Board review. The Applicants stated that there was already parking on-site, and Mr. Knight noted that the property was a vacant lot on which people were illegally parking, and it could not be used as such going forward without approvals.

HARB Meeting Minutes

October 18, 2023

Mrs. Tennis provided an overview of the project, noting that it involved a renovation of a condemned structure. She asked whether the roof would also be replaced; the Applicants confirmed that it would. Mrs. Tennis noted that an addition was also being proposed, so they would be constructing across two lots; Mr. Knight noted that they would be constructing across two lots but could consolidate the lots in the future if they so chose. The Applicants stated that the proposed addition would be constructed approximately a foot onto the current lot at 155 Sylvan Terrace.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there were any comments from the Board members on Condition #1. Mr. Henry stated that he was not in favor of allowing vinyl siding. The Applicants asked what their alternatives would be; Mr. Knight noted that the case report recommended the use of cementitious fiberboard which looked like vinyl siding but was paintable and more durable. The Applicants stated that their project designer had discussed that option with them. Mrs. Tennis asked whether the condition was acceptable to the Applicants and they confirmed that it was.

Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicants whether Condition #2, a prohibition on the use of vinyl or aluminum windows, was acceptable; they stated that there were already vinyl or aluminum windows on the property so they felt it was appropriate to replace them with vinyl windows that made them look better. Mr. Hurst stated that he felt such a proposal would validate the previous installation of vinyl windows; Mr. Knight noted that any such windows were not approved by either the City or HARB. Mr. Hurst concurred.

The Applicants stated that there were vinyl windows being installed in buildings in the neighborhood; Ms. Rucker noted that any such proposals had not been submitted to the City or approved by HARB. Mr. Knight confirmed that this created issues for this particular historic district and noted that if such work was being done in the district, then the Codes Bureau would perform site visits and issue citations to those property owners; Mr. Henry confirmed that the Codes Bureau had recently issued a Stop Work Order to an unpermitted project doing inappropriate work in the neighborhood. Ms. Rucker asked whether these properties owners were aware of the historic district requirements; Mr. Knight stated that most were aware, noting that two of the projects that were initially on the agenda for the current meeting involved unpermitted work that was conducted in the Allison Hill Historic District.

Mrs. Tennis again asked the Applicants whether they wanted to contest Condition #2; they stated that they did. They acknowledged that it was important to maintain the historic character of a property when doing work in an historic district, and stated that their design was intended to look like surrounding properties but change the home to meet modern living standards. The Applicants asked the Board to allow them to retain the vinyl windows and paint them; Mr. Knight stated that they could not install or paint vinyl windows to appear historically appropriate. The Applicants stated that they had observed such work on a site visit to Washington D.C. and Mr. Knight stated that he had not observed such work during his eleven years with the City.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there were any additional comments from the Board members regarding Condition #2. Mr. Hurst stated that vinyl windows should not have been approved in the first place and that allowing their retention or in-kind replacement would be a tacit approval of their original installation, not only in the Allison Hill Municipal Historic District, but others as

HARB Meeting Minutes

October 18, 2023

well. Ms. Rucker noted that some of the properties in the surrounding neighborhood had vinyl windows. Mr. Henry concurred that granting approval would set a bad precedent.

Mr. Hurst asked whether there was an alternative to vinyl windows that would be acceptable to both the City and the Board. Mr. Knight began to answer and Mrs. Tennis stated that the question was directed to the Applicants. They stated that they could find an alternative but also wanted to consider the maintenance cost and responsibility for future owners and ensure that whatever windows were installed would not return to the current condition; Mr. Hurst stated that he felt vinyl windows were more likely to deteriorate faster than other alternatives such as fiberglass-clad windows.

Mrs. Tennis again asked the Applicants whether they were open to an alternative besides vinyl or aluminum windows; they asked for information on wood composite windows.

Mrs. Tennis stated that she wanted more information on Ms. Rucker's references to other vinyl windows in the district, stating that she felt it gave context to the use of that material and noting that the Board could not go back in time to evaluate those projects. She asked whether the majority of windows on the block were vinyl; Mr. Knight stated that the windows along this block of Sylvan Terrace were wood. Mrs. Tennis interrupted and stated that she was talking to the Applicants.

Ms. Farren interjected and stated that there were seven conditions included in the case report and noted that two of the Board members had already indicated their opposition to the vinyl windows. She stated that the Board had to make the decision on their own and not ask the Applicants whether they agreed with it. She stated that people shouldn't interrupt each other during the discussion.

Mr. Henry moved, and Mr. Hurst seconded the motion, to retain Condition #2. The motion was adopted by a majority vote (3-0-1; Mrs. Tennis abstained).

Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicants whether Condition #3 was acceptable; they stated that it was.

Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicants whether Condition #4 was acceptable; they stated that it was not possible to retain the existing porch elements. They stated that they would be utilizing an alternative material which replicated the look of wood. Mrs. Tennis inquired about the height of the existing porch railing; Mr. Henry stated that they appeared to be three feet high. Mrs. Tennis asked what the required height was; Mr. Henry stated that it was 42 inches. Mrs. Tennis noted that if the Applicant retained the existing railing, they could keep it at three feet, but if they replaced it, they would need to install one 42 inches in height. The Applicants reiterated that the existing railings were rotted and could not be retained.

Mr. Henry asked the Applicants whether they had the ability to recreate the existing railings; they stated that the project designer was in the process of designing the new railings.

Mrs. Tennis noted that the Applicant was not intending on retaining the existing railing, posts, and brackets, but that they would instead be recreating them with an alternative material; the Applicants confirmed that was their intention. Mr. Hurst noted that that approach was consistent with the wording of Condition #4. The Applicants noted that they intended to use an alternative

HARB Meeting Minutes

October 18, 2023

product called Fypon, for both the porch elements and the cornice. Mrs. Tennis asked whether the Applicants were not agreeable to Condition #4; Ms. Farren noted that they had agreed to that condition. The Applicants reiterated that they intended to utilize the Fypon product to replicate the porch elements.

Mr. Hurst asked whether the Board was being asked to address both Conditions #4 and #5 in their discussion; Mrs. Tennis confirmed that was her intention. Mr. Hurst stated that he believed the Fypon product should not be used for either the cornice or the porch elements, although he stated that he needed more information on the proposed material. The Applicants reiterated that they felt the existing wooden features could not be reconstructed and that it was not cost-effective to replace them with historically appropriate materials. Mr. Hurst asked whether there were cost-effective materials that were more historically-appropriate. The Applicants stated that their project designer proposed Fypon; Mr. Hurst stated that it would not be an acceptable material. The Applicants asked why it was not acceptable. Mr. Hurst noted that it was a polyurethane material and that in his experience it did not weather well and was not maintainable if painted; he stated that he had the same objection if the material was used anywhere else on a property.

Mrs. Tennis stated that Ms. Rucker had indicated that it was not possible to replicate the existing porch and cornice elements with traditional materials; Ms. Rucker indicated that she had not implied that, but that it might be difficult to reuse the existing wooden elements. Mrs. Tennis asked if she had an acceptable alternative product; Ms. Rucker stated that they should provide an alternative that would be acceptable to the Board.

Mrs. Tennis asked if any of the other Board members felt Fypon was an acceptable product to use; Mr. Henry stated that he was concerned about the use of the product and noted that in a previous review of a porch project on Kelker Street, the Board had required the applicant in that case to use wooden elements in the reconstruction; he stated that he felt they would be setting a bad precedent by approving the Fypon product. Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicants if a wood composite product was acceptable; they stated that they'd have to evaluate the cost of the alternatives. Ms. Rucker suggested they speak with the project designer about alternatives.

Ms. Rucker suggested the Board table the review; the Applicants stated that continuing the case would be acceptable but stated that they had to secure the building. They noted that the project had already been delayed due to the lack of a quorum on the regularly scheduled date, and stated that they didn't want to have to demolish the building if they could not get approval in time. Ms. Rucker asked Planning Bureau staff whether the project could be put on the November HARB agenda. Mr. Knight confirmed that they could.

Mrs. Tennis suggested the Board discuss Conditions #6 and #7 so the Applicants could know if they could move forward on those aspects; she asked the Applicants whether they agreed to the conditions. Referencing Condition #6, they asked whether it meant they could paint the brick so long as the appropriate product was used. Ms. Rucker confirmed that was case, and the Applicants stated that it was acceptable.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether Condition #7 was acceptable; they Applicants stated that it would be cost-prohibitive to relocate existing real slate shingles from the rear roof to the front roof. They

HARB Meeting Minutes

October 18, 2023

stated that they were intending to use a cheaper material (GAF) that mimicked the appearance of shingles. Ms. Rucker asked the Planning Bureau staff if they were familiar with the proposed product; Mr. Knight stated that he was not, and noted that the condition proposed by the Planning Bureau would not involve any additional cost because they could utilize slate shingles from the rear mansard roof. The Applicants stated that they were thinking about the cost of maintenance to future homeowner and reiterated that slate was not cost-effective; in response, Mr. Knight reiterated that using slate which was already on the building would cost nothing.

Mrs. Tennis stated that she was only aware of one contractor that did slate roofing, and that she didn't think relocating the slate was practical; she asked the Applicants to discuss their proposed GAF product. They stated that it was an asphalt shingle product that looked like slate. Mr. Knight stated that if the Board was not in support of Condition #7, that the Applicants should be required to use synthetic slate shingles instead of the GAF shingles. Mrs. Tennis stated that the proposed product was a synthetic slate shingle and the Applicants concurred; Mr. Knight noted that GAF was not a synthetic slate product based on his review of the product on the manufacturer's website.

Mrs. Tennis stated that the Board should vote to Table Conditions #4, #5 & #7 and approve Conditions #1, #2, #3 & #6. Ms. Rucker asked whether the Board should just table the entire project until the following month's meeting; Mrs. Tennis stated that the Applicants wanted to move forward with portions of their project. They stated that they did want to secure the building and move forward with whatever approvals the Board would be willing to grant.

Mr. Hurst moved, and Ms. Rucker seconded the motion, to partially approve the project while retaining Conditions #1, #2, #3 & #6, while Tabling Conditions #4, #5 & #7 for votes at the following month's meeting. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (4-0).

4. 68 North 12th Street, filed by Larry Brown, Sr., to expand the existing single-family dwelling by constructing a new garage at the rear of the driveway and adding a second-floor expansion at the rear of the home extending over the first-floor rear porch and the garage.

The case was represented by Jonathan Thomas with Smarter Design Group (the project architect), 2630 Locust Lane, Harrisburg, PA 17109 (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 utilize the same vinyl siding on the addition as on the rest of the existing building; although not an historically-appropriate material, in this instance it is an appropriate application as the principal structure features the same cladding. If the Applicant intends on applying a new façade treatment to the entire building, the Planning Bureau would recommend a more suitable material such as cementitious fiberboard which will maintain the existing appearance and weather better than vinyl siding or EIFS.

Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicant whether they wanted to provide additional information regarding the proposal; the Applicant noted that the proposal to use EIFS was based on a recommendation of the project contractor. He stated that the use of cementitious fiberboard would only allow about

HARB Meeting Minutes

October 18, 2023

an inch of insulation to be installed on the exterior of the building, and also state that it often wasn't possible to add insulation to the interior of the building without removing walls. The Applicant stated that the rear of the property was not visible.

The Applicant stated that the EIFS would make the project more cost-effective and that the property owner intended on painting the exterior of the building to provide further insulation; he noted that the front of the building was currently clad in vinyl siding. The Applicant stated that he had advised the property owner to replace the vinyl siding with a treatment that resulted in a better appearance. He acknowledged that while EIFS was not present on the façades of any existing structures, the attached structure was clad in insulbrick siding, so there was some justification for the use of the proposed material. Mrs. Tennis stated that she felt the Applicant had provided sufficient justification for the use of the proposed siding material.

Ms. Rucker inquired as to what the EIFS material was; the Applicant noted that the name was an acronym for Exterior Insulation & Finishing System. He noted that if the property owner was required to use cementitious fiberboard, that they could only install up to an inch or so of exterior insulation without requiring the removal of all exterior walls which would significantly increase the cost of the project. Mr. Knight noted that EIFS had the appearance of stucco siding.

Mr. Knight noted that most of the buildings in the neighborhood were clad in brick, and that reviewed Google Streets View images indicated the current vinyl siding was installed at least as far back as July 2011. He noted that the case report had recommended the use of vinyl siding for the rear addition to blend in with the existing siding. Mr. Knight stated that he felt the use of EIFS would be a significant departure from the appearance of surrounding structures, but also noted that the property was located in the Summit Terrace ACOD and not a Municipal Historic District, and thus there might be a lesser standard to maintain.

Mrs. Tennis asked how the EIFS material looked and how it was applied; she inquired as to whether it was lapped like horizontal siding. The Applicant noted that it was a rigid insulation board that was adhered to the existing building treatment and would allow the property owner to better insulate the property. Mrs. Tennis inquired about the potential impact of the EIFS material on building and door openings; the Applicant confirmed that the EIFS would only be utilized for the walls and not for any window or ceiling openings. He noted that there was no other way to improve the insulation of the building.

Mr. Hurst asked how the installation of EIFS would impact any future proposals for new siding materials or new additions. The Applicant stated that they intended to install EIFS around the entire structure, including the new addition, and would be replacing the aluminum siding on the front elevation of the home and the vinyl siding on the side elevation. He noted that this would give the building a consistent appearance.

Mrs. Tennis asked Mr. Hurst if he was wondering whether the property owner would install other siding in the future; he stated that he wasn't sure whether an additional siding treatment would be installed over the EIFS in the future. The Applicant reiterated that the EIFS would be installed throughout the façade as part of the current project and that no additional siding was proposed.

HARB Meeting Minutes

October 18, 2023

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there were any questions or comments from the other Board members. Mr. Henry asked whether a Building Permit for the work had been submitted to the Codes Bureau; the Applicant stated that a permit had not been submitted because it was an after-the-fact application. Mr. Knight clarified that the rear addition was partially constructed and noted that the Codes Bureau had observed the project and issued a Stop Work Order until the required approvals were received, but he noted that the project was not finished.

Mrs. Tennis noted that the sole condition in the Planning Bureau's case report was related to the proposed siding, and asked whether there was an alternative product that could be used. The Applicant noted that there was no equivalent alternative and that the only other option would be to open up the walls and install insulation between the studs. Mr. Henry noted that the building was a balloon-frame construction and that insulation could be blown into the cavities between the walls; the Applicant stated that removing all the siding and creating new penetrations would be difficult and expensive. He stated that the Board needed to have information on alternative options ready for Applicants if they wanted alternatives for work on historic structures; he stated that he felt it would improve the appearance of the city if people could use the proposed siding.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there were any questions or comments from the other Board members regarding the EIFS or alternative siding materials; there were none. She asked whether anyone wanted to make a motion with amended conditions. Mr. Knight noted that if the Board was considering allowing the EIFS, they should specify the reasons such a decision was being made, such as the existing building featuring inappropriate siding materials. He also suggested they grant approval as a "test case" and noted that it might be interesting to see how EIFS weathered over time and how it compared to other common siding materials.

Mrs. Tennis moved, and Ms. Rucker seconded the motion, to Approve with Additional Conditions; the additional condition was that Condition #1 would be removed and installation of the EIFS would be considered a "test case." The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (4-0).

OTHER BUSINESS:

1. Discussion of proposed nomination of the Zembo Mosque (2801 North 3rd Street) to the National Register of Historic Places and vote on resolution of support to PHMC.

Mr. Knight stated that a representative from the Pennsylvania Historical & Museum Commission (PHMC) contacted the Planning Bureau, noting that the owners of the Zembo Mosque were looking to have the property added to the National Register of Historic Places, and that they were requesting a statement of support from the Board. He stated that PHMC wanted to ensure that the City was aware of the proposal and that the Board be given an opportunity to express their support.

Mr. Knight noted that the property exhibited some interesting and unique features, including the tiled interior and some of the prominent exterior architectural elements. He noted that the property was part of a corridor of architecturally diverse properties which had unique cultural and historic value to the city, including the William Penn High School, the Scottish Rite Temple, and the Keshet Israel Congregation Synagogue. He noted that support of the current nomination, which did not involve the other properties, might become part of a larger statement of support from the

HARB Meeting Minutes

October 18, 2023

Board for nomination of important buildings within the corridor. He noted the importance of expressing support for such nominations, referencing recent proposals by the School Board to demolish the William Penn building.

Mr. Knight stated that in his communications with developers of various proposals for the property, he had expressed strong opposition to the demolition of the entire structure, and primarily the more historic building at the western end along 3rd Street. He noted that a statement of support from the Board would provide additional support for adaptive reuse of the structure. Mr. Hurst noted that it would also serve as an expression of interest on behalf of the Board, informing potential developers that the Board would expect to have input on any future proposals. Mr. Knight concurred and noted that while the Board did not review proposals for individually-listed properties, they should have a formal position on such structures.

Mr. Hurst moved, and Ms. Rucker seconded the motion, to approve a resolution of support for the nomination of the Zembo Mosque to the National Register of Historic Places. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (4-0).

ADJOURNMENT: 7:56 PM

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