

Historic Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes

July 16, 2014

Chair Gary Shaffer called the Historic Architectural Review Board meeting to order at 7:09 PM on Wednesday, July 16, 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, Philip Goble and Aubrey Burkholder, Borough Code Enforcement Officer; Scott Dellett, Borough Planning Director, and Karen Mesher, Borough Management Assistant. Also in attendance were: Max Felty of Felty Investments L.P., representing 777 Baltimore Street; and Gary Casteel, representing 45 East Stevens Street.

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, August 11, 2014 at 7 PM.

Review of Agenda and Minutes

There weren't any additions or corrections to the July 16th meeting agenda, but Mr. Shaffer stated that he would have to recuse himself from item A; because he has a fiduciary relationship with that project, and that it would be the second item for review awaiting the arrival of the applicant. There was one correction to the June 18, 2014 meeting minutes. Council Member, John Butterfield, noted that on page 19 of 27 halfway down "18 East Middle Street" should be "150 North Third Street". The correction to the minutes was made, and they both were approved as submitted and amended.

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

B. Gary Casteel, 45 East Stevens Street. Demolition and New Construction. Demolish existing one-car garage with side cover; construct a 24-foot-by-32-foot accessory structure.

Mr. Dellett presented the background information on the application, as depicted in his Board Memorandum dated July 11, 2014:

DESCRIPTION

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove an existing one-car garage and to construct a new 24-foot-by-32-foot garage.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the applicant, the shed was constructed circa 1940. The shed, however, did not appear on the Borough's 1940 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps. The carport section appears to be a later addition to the structure.

GETTYSBURG DESIGN GUIDE

The following discusses outbuildings, which includes garages:

Outbuildings that remain in the Borough contribute to the understanding of the Borough's history and character. Many outbuildings reflect the style of the main building on the property. Well into the first half of the 20th Century, many garages were built with detailing to match the residence. Siding, brackets, ornament, rooftop structures or even the overall shape of the structure, were duplicated to strengthen the relationship between the main building and secondary building.

Outbuildings that date to the construction of the original property reflect an important part of the overall design concept for the property and should be retained. As some properties evolved over time, outbuildings were constructed to accommodate new uses. This practice illustrates the evolution of the property and such structure may also be significant.

Outbuildings are significant if:

" The outbuilding dates to the original construction of the property.

" The outbuilding was constructed after the main building on the site, but was erected to house a function important to the use of the overall property, or if it illustrates an event or personage important to the overall property.

" The outbuilding is a good example of a style of architecture or method of construction, or if it incorporates distinctive characteristics of form, style, detailing, use or association with other structures or uses of the site.

Because outbuildings are often important components of the overall property, removing them from the site should be avoided. Property owners should consider the relationship between the outbuildings and other buildings and site elements, the view that will result in the removal of the building and the overall condition of the building. If the outbuilding is a significant part of the property, demolition should only be considered if at least half of the structure is beyond repair.

Mr. Casteel provided a note from the present owner, Jane C. Eiker, affirming the sell/transfer of the property at 45 East Stevens Street to the Casteels. He stated that he wants to demolish the garage and side carport, and replace them with a 24-foot-by-32-foot board and batten structure, with one garage door, two service doors and up to six windows all according to code.

Mr. Shaffer asked if the Board had any questions. Ms. Hodges inquired about the placement of the structure. Mr. Casteel replied that it would be in the same location, without changing the driveway. He also wants to place a dog fence to connect the house to the building.

Mr. Shaffer presented the Findings of Fact:

" The structure at 45 East Stevens Street is a sensitive structure, as defined in Chapter 11 of the Borough Code of Ordinances, Historic Districts (Historic Districts Ordinance). A sensitive building is defined as any building that has been standing for at least 50 years at the time of the 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 outbuilding is a non-contributing structure to the Gettysburg Battlefield National Register Historic District.

" The proposed work constitutes 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 structure has limited visibility from East Stevens Street.

" The carport addition was likely a later addition to the shed.

" The structure has limited architectural significance.

Mr. Goble made a motion that the Board recommend to Borough Council to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 45 East Stevens Street for the proposed plans submitted in the June 30, 2014 application. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gustafson. The motion carried 7-to-0.

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

A. Felty Investments L.P. (Max Felty), 777 Baltimore Street. Historic Marker. Install a bronze plaque stating "National Soldiers Orphans Homestead 1866".

Ms. Gustafson presented the background information on the application (with Chair Shaffer recusing himself), as depicted in Mr. Dellett's Board Memorandum dated July 11, 2014:

DESCRIPTION

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness to install a bronze plaque stating "National Soldiers Orphans Homestead 1866" historic marker.

BUILDING HISTORY

A copy of the 1989 Historic Resource Survey Form for the property was included in the application materials.

BOROUGH SIGN ORDINANCE

According to Section 19-121.2 of Chapter 19 of the Borough Code of Ordinances, Signs, Historic Markers shall not be considered as signs for the purpose of this Part, but will be reviewed by HARB consistent with the Historic District Ordinance.

Mr. Dellett reminded the Board that historic markers are not considered signs but reviewed by the Board per the Historic District. Mr. Felty emphasized that this marker would let people know the history of the building.

Ms. Gustafson asked if the Board members had any questions for the applicant. Mr. McCabe asked about the placement of the marker, and if he would change the building back to its original appearance. Mr. Felty responded by describing the placement of the marker as presented in his packet, and that he intended to restore the building at a later date.

Ms. Gustafson presented the Findings of Fact:

" The building at 777 Baltimore Street is a sensitive building, as defined in 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 of Historic District.

" According to Section 19-121.2 of Chapter 19 of the Borough Code of Ordinances, Signs, Historic Markers shall not be considered as signs for the purpose of this Part, but will be reviewed by HARB consistent with the Historic District Ordinance.

Mr. Goble made the motion, seconded by Ms. Lingle to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the historic marker at 777 Baltimore Street as presented in the application dated July 1, 2014. The motion passed 6-to-0 with 1 abstention.

Mr. Shaffer resumed his role as Chair.

Reports

Mr. Dellett stated that he will be meeting with a representative from Preservation PA to discuss the grant that Preservation PA had received from the PA Historic Museum Commission for their circuit rider pilot program. The meeting will be Monday, July 21st at 4 PM if anyone is interested in attending.

Mr. Burkholder was contacted by a vinyl flooring manufacturer representative from Æratis PVC Porch Flooring, inquiring if their product would meet HARB's approval. He provided flooring samples and a booklet for the Board's review.

Mr. Shaffer stated that if the applicant is changing their construction material, he/she must appear before the Board. Even if they change the entire porch, the applicant must also appear before the Board.

Mr. Burkholder asked Mr. Shaffer if he had seen this flooring product before in other projects. Mr. Shaffer stated that he had seen this product before, and that it is made of plastic and not wood. It is more expensive to use, and that there are paintable/stainable options.

Ms. Gustafson stated that she knew of a lady who had this product removed, because it retained heat and produced static. It is a very new product. Mr. McCabe commented that the decking is synthetic, and he had seen railings that had deteriorated. He stated that the product is improving. Mr. Shaffer stated that the product is getting better, but that it is not structural. People are looking for maintenance-free products; but keep in mind that historic buildings and low maintenance are not always compatible.

Mr. Dellett told the Board that Council had unanimously denied the Certificate of Appropriateness for 218 Carlisle Street. He stated that no College representatives were present at the meeting.

Other Business

With no other business before the Board, the Board adjourned the meeting at 7:36 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen M. Mesher, Borough Management Assistant