

December 17, 2014
Historic Architectural Review Board Minutes
Borough of Gettysburg

Chair Gary Shaffer called the Historic Architectural Review Board meeting to order at 7:05 PM on Wednesday, October 15, 2014. The meeting was held at the Borough Municipal Building, 59 East High Street. A quorum was present. Those in attendance were: Board members Joan Hodges, Jim McCabe, Peggy Gustafson, Colleen Lingle, and Aubrey Burkholder, Borough Code Enforcement Officer; Scott Dellett, Borough Planning Director, and Karen Mesher, Borough Management Assistant. Also in attendance were: Bob Sharrah of Sharrah Design Group, Inc. (SDGI) and Hunter Johnson of TONO Architects, LLC, representing Future Stake, Inc. 297 Steinwehr Avenue; and Erin Hammerstedt representing Preservation Pennsylvania. Absent: Board member Philip Goble.

Mr. Shaffer introduced the members and explained the procedures that would be followed during the meeting. He noted that the Board serves as an advisory group to Borough Council, which makes the final decisions concerning the issuance of Certificates of Appropriateness. Borough Council will next meet on Monday, January 12, 2014 at 7 PM.

Review of Agenda and Minutes

There was one revision requested to the December meeting agenda. Mr. Shaffer noted that following the New Application for a Certificate of Appropriateness by Future Stake, he was adding 777 Baltimore Street to the agenda to discuss the owner's request for approval to restore the remaining and missing dormer windows on the third floor mansard as previously discussed at the September 17, 2014 HARB meeting. There was one correction to the October 15, 2014 Meeting Minutes. Ms. Gustafson recommended that on page 6 of 9 in the fifth paragraph, changing the word "replaced" to "removed" for clarity. The motion was made by Ms. Gustafson and seconded by Ms. Lingle to approve the October 15, 2014 Meeting Minutes as submitted with one correction. The motion passed, 6-to-0.

Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

There were no public comments for items not on the meeting agenda.

New Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness

- A. Future Stake, Inc., 297 Steinwehr Avenue. New Construction. Construction of an 8,311-square-foot restaurant on the property; application is a revision of a Certificate of Appropriateness application approved by Council on November 10, 2014.**

Mr. Shaffer explained that the new revision was an evolution of the design and the Board should review the new design as submitted for its appropriateness to the site.

Mr. Dellett presented the background information on the application as depicted in his Board Memorandum dated December 10, 2014:

BUILDING HISTORY

The property includes the Gettysburg Heritage Center (formerly the American Civil War Wax Museum & Gettysburg Gift Center), which has operated for more than 50 years. After immigrating to the United States from Poland during World War II, C. M. Uberman, founding owner and operator, opened the National Civil War Wax Museum on April 19, 1962. The property is under new ownership and interior renovations are proposed for the building to reopen as the Gettysburg Heritage Center. Construction of the building took place about the same time when the Steinwehr Avenue corridor changed into a strip development during the 1950s and 1960s.

PREVIOUS APPROVALS

Borough Council approved a Certificate of Appropriateness application to construct a new restaurant on November 10, 2014. In granting the approval, Council incorporated the Board's recommendation at its October 15, 2014, which included the following condition: building signage indicated on the plans was not part of the application approval, and the applicant shall resubmit an application should there be any changes in plans and materials.

Borough Council approved the demolition of the former Shoney's restaurant on April 12, 2004 and the demolition permit was issued on April 20, 2014. That building was constructed in the early 1960s. At the time of demolition, the building had been vacant for four years and was in poor condition. The area of the former building was planted with grass and the previous owner of the property stated the intention was to market the property for lease.

GETTYSBURG DESIGN GUIDE

According to the *Gettysburg Design Guide*, new construction is a sign of economic health and community vitality, but it leaves an indelible mark on the community. New buildings and additions can dramatically change the appearance of a neighborhood. For this reason, new construction should be compatible with historic buildings. They should not pretend to be historic or duplicate historic buildings, lest they diminish the importance of the historic buildings. New construction and additions should achieve compatibility through appropriate massing, shape, size and materials.

Below are guidelines for new construction:

- New construction should be compatible with historic buildings, while maintaining a contemporary appearance.
- New buildings should not overpower surrounding buildings.
- New buildings should not duplicate the design of nearby historic buildings.

Bob Sharrah of Sharrah Design Group, Inc. and Hunter Johnson of TONO Architects, LLC represented Future Stake, Inc., 297 Steinwehr Avenue, and gave a brief presentation to the Board. Mr. Sharrah explained that the design to the front façade did not change; but due to pricing constraints, the design to the back one-third of the building was revised. Mr. Johnson noted that there were a number of circumstances that led to the changes.

1. He discussed the Steinwehr elevation on the left side of the structure. There is a tall volume in the front one-third of the building fronting Steinwehr Avenue. The zoning overlay requires a minimum height of 24 feet for the building frontage of the site. The element that sits to the west

sits back from the street. Therefore the building is taller in the front instead of the back, calling for a change of materials architecturally. The front of the building is brick material, but the side and rear components are of clapboard siding to play down the building's formality. The design gives the appearance of a cluster of buildings that evolved over a period of time despite the single use by one tenant. The brick material has not changed. There is an oversized storefront metal clad window system on the front. The accent pieces or cornice lines will be of fiber cement. The shutters will be wood. There will be canopies across the front for shading purposes.

2. He noted that the porch element in the southwest corner will be trellis-like to enhance the patio dining experience. This is a step down entry approach to the major entrance on the west-side of the building, pulling the architecture back. The rear of the building maintains an eight-foot screen-wall component that will hide the grease traps, dumpsters and any other service amenities.
3. He pointed out that the materials that will be used will not change from the previous application. The light fixtures, standing seam metal roofing detail, fiber cement siding to the rear, brick and mortar type, and window and door systems will remain the same.

Mr. Johnson stated that there is no grade differential from the front of the building to the back. Pedestrians will travel to the front of the structure, and vehicles will park to the rear. Mr. McCabe asked if the sign will appear as depicted in the drawing. Mr. Johnson said that the sign as illustrated is painted directly on the building and illuminated; but the sign submission is a separate element. Mr. Dellett noted that the Borough's sign ordinance is a stand-alone ordinance, and that there will be no variances. Mr. McCabe asked if a small roof could be added to the left-side of the building to give a little more interest to the elevation. Ms. Gustafson pointed out that roofing-in the south elevation instead of keeping it open is a very smart way to protect outside patrons from the elements, and that the vertical support elements are very nice. She did ask if the closed doors (closed shutter effect) were the same on the west and east sides of the building. Mr. Johnson replied yes. She also commented that using a sloped awning over the two windows on the lower west-facing elevation would add to the visual affect precipitated by the change.

Mr. Shaffer made a **motion** that the Board recommend that Borough Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed plan revisions and alterations for the new design submitted for the construction project at 297 Steinwehr Avenue. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lingle. Ms. Gustafson asked if the suggestions made by the Board would be incorporated into the motion. Mr. Shaffer replied that only if the Board wanted to do so; and if the suggestions aren't included, you can vote against the motion. The motion was not altered and carried 5-to-1.

Ms. Gustafson opposed, explaining that she hoped that Future Stake would seriously consider the awning edition onto the clapboard portion as depicted in the second visual provided.

Mr. Sharrah asked to clarify whether they would have to return before the HARB should they decide to add the awnings discussed following a final cost analysis. Mr. Dellett noted that technically they should if it is a change. Mr. Shaffer stated that since this change would be a minor revision that was discussed as a part of the review, then he would recommend submitting a photo of the change and it could be handled administratively.

Mr. Shaffer recused himself as Chair at this time, because he has a fiduciary relationship with the following project at 777 Baltimore Street. Ms. Gustafson assumed the role as Chair.

B. Gary Shaffer of Shaffer Design representing Max Felty of Felty Investments, LP, 777 Baltimore Street. Revision. Approval based on past Board discussion of original HARB application to restore the remaining and the missing dormer windows on the third floor mansard.

Mr. Shaffer presented the request by the owner, Max Felty, to restore the remaining and missing dormer windows on the third floor mansard. The possibility of finding and revealing the missing dormer windows was discussed during the applicants original application presented on September 17, 2014. Mr. Goble at that time referenced Plate #8 provided in the application depicting dormers on the front side of the building; and a discussion ensued:

“Ms. Hodges asked about the health of the structure’s brick. Mr. Felty stated that it looked good, but they will address any issues as they arise. Mr. McCabe observed that it looked like the structure sustained a lot of additions over the years. Mr. Felty responded that he could not see the historic structure past all of the additions. Ms. Gustafson asked why dormers weren’t added to the mansard roof. Mr. Felty explained that there is a functioning third-floor apartment with the kitchen on the front wall where the appliances and cabinets are located. Mr. Goble asked if dummy dormers were considered, and that they would not have to be functional. He referred to Plate #8 in the application packet which shows dormers on the front side. Mr. Goble stated that he did not think that the dummy dormers to the front would increase the construction cost significantly. Mr. Shaffer responded noting that this building incurred a lot of dummy additions to the structure over the years. The dummy dormers would be a maintenance issue with access to them difficult. There was a dummy room that was originally added for looks, but it was removed due to lack of access; so the preference would be to not add anything more to this structure. He noted that there are seven remaining windows with one that was converted to a door. Mr. McCabe stated that the addition of the dummy dormers would recreate the original appearance of the building, and that a lot of structures have them and are not functional” (September 17, 2014 HARB Minutes).

This request confirms the discovery of the two dormers as depicted in the presented pictures and documented by original photographs of their existence. Mr. Shaffer stated that the owner is simply asking to restore the newly discovered dormers to their original state per the previous discussion of the original application and to continue that discussion.

Ms. Hammerstedt asked if the building materials had already been discussed, and Ms. Gustafson asked if the original windows would be replicated. Mr. Shaffer stated that the dormer locations were concealed, and one partially intact dormer was recently discovered this past Monday during restoration. The left arch-topped dormer is 70 percent intact and the window is in excellent shape, and could be replicated to replace the right dormer. Mr. Dellett wanted to incorporate the *Findings of Fact* as presented during the original application on September 17th:

- Chapter 11 of the Borough Code of Ordinances, Historic Districts (Historic District Ordinance). A sensitive building is defined as any building that has been standing for at least 50 years at the time of application, even though it has been considerably modified and certain sites of later

historic significance or buildings that the Board has determined to be exemplary of later architectural styles.

- The building is a contributing structure to the Gettysburg Battlefield National Register Historic District.
- The proposed work is a permanent change, making this proposal a critical project, which is defined in the Historic Districts Ordinance as "A project involving demolition of all or part of any building or change in configuration and rhythm of any building as a whole, or any alteration to a sensitive building."
- The building has been considerably altered.

Mr. Dellett wanted to note that this discussion is to merely confirm the newly discovered windows, and that they represent the original design of the building. He had asked Mr. Burkolder if their restoration would be a significant change to the building permit. Mr. Burkolder responded no. Mr. Dellett stated that if there were no objections from the Board and no significant changes made to the building permit, that the restoration of the dormer windows be approved administratively.

Ms. Gustafson called for a motion to recommend a Certificate of Appropriateness to repair any elements of the first dormer window and replicate the second dormer window using the same materials. A discussion commenced regarding the need for a Certificate of Appropriateness versus handling the restoration administratively. Ms. Hammerstedt stated that an amendment to the original application could be made, clarifying the original Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Dellett said that the previously approved application could be amended to include the restoration of the historic windows as previously discussed. Ms. Lingle emphasized the use of the same materials, replacing a feature with an in-kind feature.

Ms. Hammerstedt said that this project revision is adding a feature, thus not preserving but rehabilitating. To protect the Board, the amendment should be noted as a clarification. Mr. Shaffer commented that the intent was not to delay the project pending approval. Mr. Dellett stated that the Board document the newly discovered dormers, amend the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness to include the restoration, and approve the revision administratively.

Following a brief discussion, Ms. Gustafson made a **motion** to amend the previously approved Certificate of Appropriateness to include the restoration of the newly discovered existing dormers at 777 Baltimore Street using historic materials. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lingle. The motion carried 5-to-0 with one abstention.

Mr. Shaffer resumed his role as Chair.

New Business

Ms. Hammerstedt reported that tonight's training session on *New Construction in Historic Districts* for HARB Board members was two hours long. She asked that the Board return all Commission Member Questionnaires to Mr. Dellett. She tentatively announced that the next session, a walking tour of the Gettysburg Historic District, would be held on April 29, 2015 from 4 PM to 8 PM. She indicated that she

HARB Minutes

December 17, 2014

Page 5 of 6

would like to finish tonight's training on new construction prior to the regularly scheduled HARB meeting on February 18th from 4:30 PM to 6:30 PM.

Reports

Mr. Dellett gave his monthly report. He asked that the Board consider candidates for the Historic Preservation Awards in May. He noted that regarding the Preservation Pennsylvania CLG Circuit Rider Grant, the proposed demolition of 58-60 Breckenridge Street could be discussed. He said that the placement and regulation of satellite dishes on buildings located in the Historic District could be another discussion topic.

With no other business before the Board, the Board adjourned the meeting at 8 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen M. Mesher
Borough Management Assistant