

MINUTES

**HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
November 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
Kent Hurst

MEMBERS ABSENT: April Rucker
Camille Bennett

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

OTHERS PRESENT: See Sign-In Sheet

CALL TO ORDER: 6:00 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Minutes for the October 18th HARB meeting had not been prepared as of the November meeting, and thus there were no minutes on which to take action.

OLD BUSINESS:

- 1. 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.**

Mrs. Gribble asked Planning Bureau staff to provide a synopsis of where the discussion during the previous month's meeting had ended. Mr. Knight outlined the Planning Bureau's case report and recommendations, and provided a synopsis of the discussion from the previous month's meeting. He noted that Conditions #1, #2, #3 & #6 were agreed upon by the Board and the Applicants, and that the remaining conditions were tabled until the current meeting. He stated that he had discussed with the Law Bureau the process taken by the Board at the previous month's meeting, as they had voted on conditions individually, which was an unusual approach to a project review. Mr. Knight noted that the Law Bureau confirmed that conditions could not be voted on individually and that, while the Board could discuss whether they wanted to retain or alter conditions, they could only take a single vote on the project as a whole.

HARB Meeting Minutes

November 6, 2023

Mr. Styer clarified that the City's regulations required votes "by application," so partial project approvals by voting on individual conditions did not conform to the regulations. Mr. Knight noted that because the Applicants and Board had agreed upon Conditions #1, #2, #3 & #6, there would effectively be no change in how those were applied to project, just that they could not be formally voted on individually.

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

Mrs. Gribble noted that she was not in attendance at the previous month's meeting, and reviewed the conditions which had been voted on the that meeting. She noted that Conditions #4, #5 & #7 still needed to be discussed by the Board. Mr. Hurst noted that Conditions #4 & #5 were related in that the Applicants indicated that they intended to recreate the front porch elements with the same material proposed for the cornice, an aspect that the Planning Bureau had recommended be denied. The Applicants stated that their plan was more cost-effective and would maintain the appearance of the property.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there were any questions or comments from the other Board members; Mr. Henry requested confirmation that the Fypon material would be used for the front porch elements; the Applicants confirmed that was the case. Mr. Hurst asked whether the material could be milled to reproduce the existing porch elements. The Applicants referred the question to their contractor, Zach Jackson (7 Fortuna Lane, Enola, PA), stated that the existing porch elements could be recreated, but that it was more cost-effective to use the Fypon product. Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicants to confirm that Fypon was a fabricated product that could be milled as needed; they confirmed that was the case.

Mr. Hurst asked whether it was a reasonable concession to allow the Applicants to use Fypon but require that the existing elements of the porch be recreated; Mr. Jackson asked what the alternative was and Mr. Hurst stated that they could use wood. Mr. Jackson stated that they had recreated historic wooden posts for other projects in historic districts along 2nd Street, but that he hadn't done the type of post featured on the front porch, but that he could produce similar posts in his shop.

Mr. Hurst stated that the railings should be easy to replace in-kind but noted that the gingerbread along the porch cornice might be more difficult; he asked whether the Applicants proposed to recreate the porch details or remove them altogether. They stated that they planned to remove all the porch details. Mr. Hurst asked whether they intended on replacing those features at all; they confirmed that they were not planning on replacing anything but the porch posts.

Mrs. Tennis stated that there had been an extensive discussion during the previous meeting and that they had discussed each aspect of the conditions in the case report because the Applicants didn't have the document. She stated that she had not been aware that Applicants did not have access to the case report; Mr. Knight confirmed that anyone from the public could access the case documentation online and noted that he apprised applicants of this in both the letter and email they received regarding the meeting agendas. Mrs. Tennis asked how applicants would know that it was available. Mr. Knight reiterated that they were apprised of the availability in the emails and letters he transmitted to applicants. Mrs. Tennis stated that before she served on the Board, she had been

HARB Meeting Minutes

November 6, 2023

an Applicant and had not been aware that case documentation was available prior to a meeting. She reiterated that the Board had held extensive discussions on the conditions at the previous month's meeting.

Mrs. Tennis noted that the project involved multiple parcels, including one on which a building existed and others which were vacant; she stated that it was unreasonable and cost-prohibitive to ask developers to recreate architectural elements across both properties. Mrs. Gribble stated that the Board's job was to represent the building and the integrity of the historic district. Mrs. Tennis asked whether Mrs. Gribble would advocate for recreating the gingerbread from her professional perspective as an architect. Ms. Farren interjected and noted that the question was not relevant to the case; she stated that hypothetical scenarios were unrelated to the current review.

Mrs. Gribble noted that the Board's purview was the exterior of any building within an historic district and that they followed the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and their own Historic District Design Guidelines. She noted that these documents outlined approaches to adaptive reuse projects, façade changes, additions, or demolitions, and that it was the Board's job to maintain notable historic features of buildings such as the porch gingerbread. She acknowledged that the Applicants were attempting to improve a condemned building but reiterated that the Board's responsibility was maintaining the appearance of the building and streetscape.

The Applicants asked if she had driven on the street; Mrs. Gribble stated that she had conducted a site visit a few weeks ago. They stated that there were properties that needed rehabilitating and that enforcing the Board's standards was unfair to people who were trying to renovate their properties. Mrs. Gribble noted that the Board's purview was to enforce the aforementioned regulations and noted that successful and consistent enforcement of historic standards contributed to the economic vitality of neighborhoods. She reiterated that the Board's goal was to represent the buildings.

The Applicants stated that they felt the Board preferred to have buildings remain condemned rather than see them fixed up; they stated that they weren't able to comply with the conditions in the case report. They asked what would happen if they did not follow the recommendations of the Board; Mrs. Gribble stated that there were options for the Applicants to take once the Board made their recommendations. Mrs. Tennis stated that the Applicants have a right to appeal any determination of the Board; the Applicants stated that the appeal process would allow deterioration to occur and the building to collapse. Mr. Styer noted that the Board could choose to strike a condition if there was consensus for such an action.

Mr. Knight stated that the Planning Bureau was supportive of the overall project, and noted that the Applicants were claiming a financial hardship but were also proposing to add a two-story addition to the side of the property in addition to demolishing and rebuilding the rear of the property. The Applicants claimed they were not asserting a financial hardship justification, but that they were questioning the cost of preserving the streetscape. They stated that the Planning Bureau wanted the Applicants to keep the city beautiful and maintain historic appeal based on their own standards, but that it was not financially possible to use wooden windows; Mr. Knight noted that the case report contained no such condition and, in fact, had recommended that the project be permitted to utilize fiberglass windows.

HARB Meeting Minutes

November 6, 2023

Mrs. Tennis asked Mr. Knight whether his recommendation was based on his position within the Planning Bureau or as the Secretary of the Board; he noted that as the Planning Director, he was currently also serving as the HARB Secretary. Mrs. Tennis noted that the Law Bureau had informed the Board they could take a vote on the issue, which was a condition contained in the case report, so that they could close discussion on the issue; she stated that they had previously indicated that the Board could not approach their vote in that way. Mr. Knight noted that the Law Bureau had not said that. Mr. Styer clarified that the Law Bureau was addressing the manner in which the case had been reviewed and noted that while the Board could choose to strike conditions in the case report from their final recommendation, they still had to vote on the project as a whole based on their discussion.

Mrs. Gribble stated that the Board should return to discussing the other conditions in the case report; the Applicants noted that Condition #7 had not yet been decided. Mrs. Tennis asked whether the Board was discussing only the existing porch, or including a proposed porch that extended onto the adjacent lot; Mr. Knight noted that the project did not include an extension of the front porch, but rather the construction of a separate, two-story addition. Mrs. Tennis noted that the project involved new construction next to an historic property; she stated that it didn't make sense to have them restore some historic elements and allow a modern addition. Mr. Knight stated that if Mrs. Tennis felt that way, she should vote not to approve the new construction element; he reiterated that the porch would not be extended to the proposed addition. Mrs. Tennis stated that that was not her point; Mr. Knight stated that he was unsure of why she would reference that.

Mr. Hurst moved, and Mrs. Tennis seconded the motion, to remove Condition #4. Mrs. Gribble stated that she felt the Board should withhold voting until all the conditions had been discussed, per the Law Bureau's prior instructions. She noted that Mrs. Tennis' motion could be addressed at the time. The Law Bureau confirmed that Mrs. Gribble could choose to proceed with the discussion at that time. Mrs. Tennis stated that her approach had already been done at a previous meeting that was rescheduled due to a lack of quorum, and expressed concern that any delays would adversely impact the building. Mrs. Gribble noted that they would vote on this condition amongst others at the end of their discussion.

Ms. Farren interjected and noted that Mrs. Tennis was a Board member, and was not either the Applicants or their representative and that it was her duty to be an advocate for the Board, not an advocate for the Applicants. Mrs. Tennis stated that she was doing her job as a volunteer.

Mrs. Gribble stated that she was not intending on postponing the application, but wanted to ensure that they discussed the last condition before the Board voted on the project as an application. She stated that this was how the Board had always reviewed projects procedurally. Mr. Hurst stated that he was willing to set aside his motion for the moment to discuss the final condition; he noted that the last condition was independent of the other conditions and thus would not impact the Board's consideration of the front porch elements.

Mrs. Gribble read Condition #7, which recommended salvaging real slate shingles from the rear mansard roof and installing them on the front mansard roof, and asked the Applicants whether they would consider doing that. The Applicants claimed that such a condition made no sense. Mr. Hurst

HARB Meeting Minutes

November 6, 2023

noted that the slate shingles on the rear of the building could be repurposed for use on the front of the house; he recalled that the Applicants were concerned that removing the shingles on the rear would damage the building [note: the Applicants intended to do this anyways to install the proposed vinyl siding] and noted that they were proposing to use faux shingles. Mr. Knight noted that there was discussion about the use of synthetic slate shingles as opposed to asphalt shingles; he noted that the Board had approved such proposals in the past which was why it was recommended as a condition. Mr. Hurst asked whether the discussion at the previous meeting resulted in an agreeable solution; the Applicants noted that they had discussed options, but had not settled on an alternative.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicants whether they would be agreeable to using a synthetic slate product; they responded that they would. Mrs. Gribble noted that Condition #7 should be altered to state that the Applicants could use real or synthetic slate shingles. Mr. Knight concurred and noted that it would give the Applicants the option and that hopefully they would be able to salvage real slate shingles from the rear roof.

Mrs. Gribble noted that the Board had to resolve the issues surrounding Conditions #4 & #5, and noted that they had heard from two Board members; she asked Mr. Henry whether he had thoughts on the conditions. He stated that he felt Fypon was an historically-inappropriate material, and that he felt a more appropriate material should be used and that the design elements of the porch should be retained.

Mrs. Gribble read through the conditions, noting that she had not been at the previous meeting. She asked whether agreement had been reached on an alternative for Condition #1; Mr. Knight stated that he believed the Applicants had agreed to use cementitious fiberboard or, at least, that vinyl siding had not been approved.

Mrs. Gribble asked how the Board should navigate the impasse over Conditions #4 & #5, on which there was no consensus. Mr. Styer noted that Mr. Hurst could propose his motion to remove those conditions, but noted that three votes would be required for it to pass. Mrs. Tennis noted that there was a second to that motion, and asked whether it need to be moved again. Mr. Styer stated that Mr. Hurst should re-raise the motion. Mr. Hurst moved, and Mrs. Tennis seconded the motion, to remove Condition #4. The motion was rejected on a split vote (2-2).

Mrs. Gribble noted that the motion failed and asked the Board whether they wanted to vote on the remaining conditions. Mrs. Tennis asked whether they were permitted to do so, given the previous discussion. Mr. Styer stated that they were proposing a motion to strike a condition, and not to approve an aspect of the project, which occurred separately through a vote on the entire application. Mr. Styer noted that in the previous meetings, there had been votes to *approve* individual elements outside of the overall project. Mrs. Tennis stated that the Board couldn't know since they didn't have meeting minutes and noted that both members of the Law Bureau were present at the previous meeting. She stated that the Board had approached every project that way; Mr. Knight interjected and stated that the Board had not done that for every case.

Mrs. Tennis stated that the Board had taken multiple votes on individual conditions regarding the case; Mr. Styer noted that those votes were not in question. Mrs. Tennis stated that she wanted

HARB Meeting Minutes

November 6, 2023

clarity on how the Board was supposed to discuss and consider conditions in the future. Mr. Styer stated that the laws which governed the Board stated that projects must be voted on an “application level,” considering the entirety of the proposal, meaning that individual votes on components of a project were not valid. Mrs. Tennis asked why the Law Bureau allowed the Board to vote on and table individual conditions due to time during the last meeting. Ms. Farren noted that discussion on the individual conditions at the last meeting was not tabled due to time, but rather because there was no consensus among the Board members; she noted that the Board had not voted on the entire application.

Mr. Hurst brought the discussion back to the current project, and stated that the votes on individual conditions could be considered as “sentiments” of Board members, to simplify the project and focus the Board on issues for which there was no consensus.

Mrs. Tennis stated that even though there were no minutes, she explicitly recalled the discussion. She stated that the initial hearing for the project was rescheduled once, and that given the condition of the property and the pending winter, she felt the project needed to move forward. She stated that the Board had voted to approve the application at the previous meeting [note: the application was not approved at the October 2023 HARB meeting]. She stated that the application was not tabled because they had voted to approve individual aspects of the project. Ms. Farren informed her that that did not constitute approval of the application. Mrs. Tennis reiterated that she felt the application had been approved, but was left open to discussion, and that the Board had asked the Applicants to return with samples of the proposed Fypon product; she noted that they had brought the project contractors with them to the current meeting. Mr. Styer stated that the votes at the previous meeting were considered clarification on items for discussion, but not a formal vote on the project, because individual aspects of the project had been tabled.

Mr. Knight noted that the Board’s position had not changed on the items on which there was consensus at the previous meeting, and that the current discussion only involved aspects of the project which Mrs. Tennis, as the Acting Chair, had moved to table at the previous meeting. He noted that the current discussion had not changed any decisions from the October 2023 meeting.

The Applicants asked what their next steps would be if they did not want to move forward with the project under the conditions approved by the Board. Mrs. Gribble stated that the Board would act on the overall application with modifications to certain conditions. Mr. Knight noted that the issues on which there were disagreement were not critical to the structural integrity of the building; he noted that the Applicants could still do much of what they initially proposed regardless of how the Board voted on individual aspects. He noted that a disagreement on retention of the porch gingerbread or railings or replacement of the cornice did not preclude the Applicants from replacing the roof or doing other structural work to ensure the maintenance of the structure.

Mr. Knight noted that the Applicants could resubmit alternative proposals in the future without impacting their ability to stabilize the building and conduct many of the improvements they initially proposed. The Applicants asked whether the Planning Bureau was now supporting the removal of the porch elements; Mr. Knight clarified that he was just providing an example for how the project could move forward in phases if the Board applied the conditions in the case report, and reiterated the City’s opposition to the removal of those elements. The Applicants expressed

HARB Meeting Minutes

November 6, 2023

confusion and stated that if the Planning Bureau wanted to retain those elements, that should be the City's position. Mr. Knight reiterated that the Applicant's should retain, repair, or replace in-kind the existing porch elements; he noted that wooden, turned-spindle railings with top and bottom bars were cheap and could be purchased off the shelf at most home improvement stores.

Mrs. Gribble clarified that regardless of the conditions imposed by the Board, the Applicants had the ability to make any internal changes to the property that they wanted; she noted that there was agreement between all parties on Conditions #1, #2, #3 & #6, so those aspects could all be completed. She stated that the Applicants could keep the porch elements intact for the time being, and resubmit for a future date.

Mrs. Tennis stated that she wasn't sure that a tie vote meant that the motion failed; Ms. Farren clarified that it did because a majority vote was needed to approve a motion.

Mrs. Gribble moved, and Mr. Henry seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff & Additional Conditions; the additional condition was that Condition #7 would be modified to allow the use of synthetic slate shingles on the front mansard roof projection. The motion was adopted by a majority vote (3-0-1; Mrs. Tennis abstained).

Mrs. Tennis stated that she abstained because the process was unclear to her. Mr. Hurst noted that by voting to approve the project with the single modified condition, they could move ahead on the majority of the project on which there was consensus. He stated that for any remaining issues, such as the porch features, the Applicants could move forward with a phased approach which might mean removing them to have them recreated. Mr. Knight stated that the Applicants should not do that as they did not receive approval for that and Mrs. Gribble concurred. She noted that if the Applicants wanted to do any aspect of the project not approved by the Board during their current vote, they could resubmit new applications with new proposals or proceed in a manner that followed the Historic District Design Guidelines.

Mr. Knight noted that the Board had effectively authorized the Applicants to do every aspect of the project except for the porch and cornice; they could just leave those aspects of the project aside, and complete all the other work on the building. Mr. Henry concurred.

Mrs. Tennis reiterated her abstention and stated that she felt the Board already voted to move forward at the previous meeting. The Applicants noted that their records showed the Board had approved Conditions #1, #2, #3 & #6. Mrs. Gribble agreed and noted that the current vote had not changed the informal approvals granted at the previous meeting. Mr. Knight and Mr. Styer concurred.

The Applicants stated that they need some clarification on the overall project, and requested permission to allow their contractor to ask a question. Mr. Jackson confirmed that he could install the required gingerbread, but noted that the posts may be more difficult. He asked Mrs. Gribble and Mr. Henry why they did not support replacement of the posts. Mrs. Gribble noted that the Secretary of the Interior's Standards stated that distinctive historic features should be replaced in-kind both in terms of the material and design. Mr. Jackson stated that they could get posts of the same size, but that it might be difficult to find ones with the exact same profile.

HARB Meeting Minutes November 6, 2023

Mrs. Gribble noted that the Board had approved the project with the conditions by virtue of the three votes. Mr. Knight stated that he would follow up with the Applicants on the conditions adopted by the Board in their decision. Mr. Knight noted that cementitious fiberboard was an approvable alternative to vinyl siding and that fiberglass windows would also be appropriate for replacement windows. Mrs. Gribble noted that the Applicants should confirm any alternative materials with the Planning Bureau.

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. 1161 Derry Street, filed by Mark Brown, to replace the decorative wooden headers on all the windows with steel and brick headers. This is an after-the-fact application.**
- 2. 1163 Derry Street, filed by Mark Brown, to replace the decorative wooden headers on all the windows with steel and brick headers; to replace the wooden sills with brick sills; to replace the rear porch with historic wooden railings and brackets with pressure-treated lumber; and to remove the historic metal fence enclosing the rear yard.**

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the cases could be reviewed together; Mr. Knight stated that he agreed with that proposal since they were owned by the same entity and involved the same issues. She asked whether the Applicant was in attendance; they were not. Mrs. Gribble asked whether a vote was needed to move the cases to the back of the agenda; Mr. Styer confirmed that no such vote was needed.

After review of the final application, Mrs. Gribble noted that the Applicant had not arrived during the meeting. Mr. Knight noted that the Planning Bureau's position was usually that applications be continued in such cases to allow the Applicant to present their proposal to the Board. Mr. Hurst asked if the Applicant was aware their project would be heard by the Board at the current meeting. Mr. Knight confirmed that they did and noted that he was supposed to be on the agenda for the previous month's meeting, but that he had moved it to the current agenda to allow the Applicant to submit the fees for after-the-fact applications and to develop more documentation in support of their proposal, which was recommended for denial by the Planning Bureau. He noted that the Applicant had submitted the requisite fees, but had not submitted any additional documentation.

Mr. Hurst asked if he expected the Applicant to provide more documentation. Mr. Knight stated that he would reach out to him to let him know he missed the meeting and to remind him that he should provide more documentation.

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

- 3. 225 North Street, filed by Larry Saylor with TKS Architects on behalf of St. Patrick's School Catholic Parish, to install a four-foot-high, powder-coated aluminum fence with an automated gate along the North Street frontage of the parking lot.**

HARB Meeting Minutes

November 6, 2023

The case was represented by Dakota Bitner with JEM Group (the project contractor), 214 Senate Avenue, Camp Hill, PA 17011 (aka “the Applicant”).

A member of the public, Ms. Kathy Speaker-MacNett (224 North Street, Harrisburg, PA) noted that it was difficult to hear testimony and requested that the Board members and applicants speak louder.

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

1. The Planning Bureau would encourage the Applicant to consider the replacement of the existing chain-link fence and gate enclosing the other side of the parking lot along Liberty Street, with a fence in the same height and design as that being proposed in the current application, to ensure a more appropriate material and design and more visual coherence.
2. The Applicant should consider installing planters in the proposed “No Parking” area to screen the parking lot from the street.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant whether they wanted to provide additional information regarding the proposal. The Applicant noted that the proposed vehicular gate would be manually operated and not automatic; he noted that the project was intended to make the play area safer for students and to better manage vehicular circulation.

Mrs. Gribble referenced Condition #1 and asked whether the Applicant knew if the property owner would be able to replace the existing chain link fence along the southern boundary of the parking lot with the design being proposed as part of the current project; he stated that the budget for the current scope of work did not include a replacement of that fence, although they would certainly consider that when that section needed maintenance or replacement. Mrs. Gribble asked if there was any issue with Condition #2; the Applicant noted that they were intending on striping “no parking” lines, but that it would not preclude the addition of planters. Mr. Knight noted that it wasn’t meant to be a landscaped area, but rather moveable planter boxes or heavy planters.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there were any questions or comments from the other Board members; there were none.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there were any comments from the public for or against the project. Ms. Colleen MacNett (610 Church Street, Harrisburg, PA) asked Planning Bureau staff to read the reason for approval related to public safety; Mr. Knight reread all of the reasons for approval from the case report. Ms. MacNett noted that student loading and unloading was a longstanding issue between the school and the neighborhood; she also noted that the property had been posted the previous Friday and thus many of the neighbors were not aware that the project was being discussed at the current meeting. Mr. Knight apologized and noted that due to staffing constraints, he was not able to get minutes complete and the notices posted for the current meeting.

Mrs. Tennis asked what the requirement for public notification was; Mrs. Farren stated that the requirement was 24 hours. Mr. Knight stated that it sounded as though the question was related to physically posting properties and not posting of the agenda and application materials to the Planning Bureau’s webpage.

HARB Meeting Minutes

November 6, 2023

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the Board needed to discuss the issue of public notice under Other Business, or whether they should wait for confirmation from the Law Bureau regarding the current issue. Ms. Farren asked Ms. MacNett whether she was speaking for or against the project; she stated that she had concerns about traffic circulation, but noted that they might fall outside of the purview of the Board. She stated that if the fence was closed during school hours, she was concerned that it would increase traffic in the surrounding neighborhood, although she acknowledged that it might be outside the scope of the Board.

Mrs. Gribble asked Planning Bureau staff whether the concern was a zoning issue; Mr. Knight stated that it was not, but rather that operation of the fence, as opposed to installation of the fence, likely fell outside of the Board's jurisdiction. He suggested that the issue would best be addressed by coordination between the local residents and the school, or in consultation with the City Engineer; he noted that a traffic impact study may be required. Mrs. Tennis inquired as to which fence Ms. MacNett was referencing, noting there was an existing fence on the south side of the parking lot in addition to the proposed fence on the north side. Ms. MacNett confirmed she was referencing the proposed fence on the northern side of the property.

Mr. Knight stated that he felt the Board could take a vote on the current proposal, and that neighbors of the project could contact the City Engineer's Office to discuss options for addressing their concerns. Mrs. Tennis stated that she hoped the discussion at the current meeting could inform their discussion with the City.

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

4. 217 State Street, filed by Ron Shaffer, to replace the existing wooden, half-view door with a solid, paneled wooden door.

The case was represented by Ronald Shaffer (the property owner), 217 State Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101 (aka "the Applicant").

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

1. If granted approval, the Applicant will also replace the existing transom with a rectangular plate-glass transom resembling that of the adjacent property at 219 State Street, as the project is intended to recreate the likely historic appearance of the building.
2. While the current proposal only involves the replacement of the front door, the Bureau would recommend that the Applicant also be given approval to replace the awning with materials and design that reflect that of 219 State Street, if they choose to do so at a later date, in consultation with Planning Bureau staff.

Mr. Knight noted that the proposed door was likely similar to the original door on-site, and stated that he would have granted administrative approval for the project had the Applicant been able to provide photos from before the current door was installed. He noted that the Applicant had contacted the Historic Harrisburg Association (HHA) and the Historic Society of Dauphin County

HARB Meeting Minutes

November 6, 2023

(HSDC), but were unable to locate any such photos, and thus he felt that the project should be brought before the Board out of an abundance of caution.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant whether they wanted to provide additional information regarding the proposal. The Applicant stated that the purpose of the project was to provide additional security to their home.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there were any questions or comments from the other Board members; there were none. She stated that the proposed door appeared to match the door of the adjacent building at 219 State Street. She asked the Applicant whether they intended on replacing the transom as well; he confirmed that they would be replacing the transom as well and noted that they were considering other alterations to the property in the future, such as the replacement of the awning over the front door.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Planning Bureau whether their conditions of approval were intended to grant preapproval of a canopy replacement. Mr. Knight stated that in previous communications with the Applicant, they had indicated that they might be replacing the awning and other elements in the future; he noted that he had recommended they match the awning of the adjacent property as it was likely original to the building. He noted that the awning was likely replaced at the same time as the door, and that the work was completed at the same time as other replacements including the headers over the windows. Mr. Knight noted that he wanted to give the Board the option of allowing the Planning Bureau to administratively approve an appropriate design; the Applicant stated that he didn't mind submitting future aspects to the Board for their review.

Mrs. Gribble stated that she felt it was generally a moot point, as it would be reinstalling an element that previously existed on-site. Mr. Knight stated that the Planning Bureau generally granted approval of such projects if applicants could demonstrate that it previously existed on-site.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there were any questions or concerns from the other Board members regarding the proposal; there were no comments or questions.

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

OTHER BUSINESS: N/A

ADJOURNMENT: 7:22 PM

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