

Historic Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes

July 7, 2014

Chair Gary Shaffer called the special meeting of the Historic Architectural Review Board to order at 7 PM on Monday, July 7, 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 Phil Goble; Scott Dellett, Borough Planning Director, Aubrey Burkholder, Borough Code Enforcement Officer and Karen Mesher, Borough Management Assistant. Also in attendance were: Jim Biesecker and Bill Baldwin, representing 218 Carlisle Street.

Mr. Shaffer introduced the members and explained the procedures that would be followed during this special 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. He stated that no application can go before Borough Council, according to the rules of operation specific to this Board, without a majority vote of the Board, requiring four votes for or against, before it could be processed. Borough Council will next meet on Monday, July 14, 2014 at 7 PM.

Review of Agenda and Minutes

Mr. Shaffer explained that the June meeting minutes are simply a reference for this meeting and will not be approved at this time. He stated that this meeting is an extension of the June meeting, so that the Board can continue the discussion of the two applications.

Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

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

Applications for Certificates of Appropriateness

A. Paul English / The Sewing Factory, 26 North Fourth Street. Alteration. Replace the main building's metal roof with high-definition asphalt shingles.

Mr. Shaffer stated that the applicant's presence tonight was excused because of his presence at the prior two meetings. Mr. Shaffer explained that the vote at the last meeting was 3 in favor and one against, therefore the application could not go forward as presented. And in accordance with the Board Solicitor's advice that all votes must be taken at the public meeting, votes sent in by e-mail could not be counted. Therefore the original Application for the Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of the metal roof at 26 North Fourth Street with high definition shingles will be considered.

Mr. Shaffer recommended that a motion be made to accept the application as originally submitted, and that Borough Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property at 26 North Fourth Street for the proposed plans and work to replace the existing roof with an asphalt shingle roof. Mr. Goble made the motion and it was seconded by Ms. Hodges. The motion carried 6-to-1.

Mr. McCabe explained that the roof had been deteriorating for a long time, so the metal roof is probably over 50 years old and of historic nature. He further explained that the roof was never asphalt shingles, and that a terrible precedent would be set by this Board allowing the use of asphalt shingles to replace any roof of historical significance in the Historic District. Mr. Shaffer noted for the record Mr. McCabe's opinion, and stated that the vote recommending the application to Borough Council was 6-to-1.

B. Gettysburg College/ Appleford Hall and Carriage House, 218 Carlisle Street. Alteration. Replace the front windows on the building used for student housing.

Mr. Shaffer referred the Board to the original application presented at the May 21st meeting, and to the background information on the application as depicted in Mr. Dellett's Board Memorandum dated June 17, 2014. The applicant requested that a Certificate of Appropriateness be issued to replace the existing front windows at Appleford Hall with solid wood windows. Mr. Biesecker stated that they did get approval to replace the north, south and west windows of the property, but had to respond to questions about the east windows of the house and the carriage house: were the windows original to the house and were they made of mahogany? They submitted a research

presentation and a study done by Elwood Christ in 1990. The windows on the back of the house were replaced in the 1920s and resembled the windows on the front of the house. The front windows were pine windows and not mahogany. Therefore, the applicant maintains that the request for a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing front windows at Appleford Hall with solid wood windows remains the same as the original request. He stated that they would be happy to answer any further questions.

Ms. Gustafson asked if the air conditioner in the front third-floor window could be moved to a side window. Mr. Baldwin stated that the side window was a bathroom window and not located in a living space. She also inquired about the location of the windows depicted in the submitted pictures showing window damage. Mr. Baldwin was not sure of their exact location, but stated that it was most likely a first-floor front window. Ms. Gustafson highlighted that the first-floor front (under-the-porch) windows appear to be very old, as evidenced by her own pictures depicting one as mortised together with pins. Ms. Gustafson asked, to their knowledge, if the first-floor windows were ever opened since the College has owned the property. She stated that those windows were not opened when the Keiths had lived there. Mr. Biesecker stated that he was not sure if they were ever opened, or if they ever contained air conditioning units.

Mr. Shaffer stated that so many windows were already granted a Certificate of Appropriateness to be replaced, and that the front windows are of significant historical significance to the Borough, representing a style from the 1870s-1880s. He asked why it was of critical importance to remove/replace these front windows, because it goes against everything that the Historic District represents. Mr. Biesecker replied that those window were probably replaced in the 1920s when the addition was added. Mr. Baldwin stated that the front sashes, sills and lower frames are in bad shape. He emphasized that if the lower frames and sashes were replaced, then you would have a whole new window. Mr. Baldwin had experienced failure with similar repairs at one of their other properties.

Mr. Shaffer stated that during the restoration to the Brafferton Inn by Ms. Hodges, she had historical storm windows installed over the original windows, because their replacement was not approved. The Swope Mansion was denied the replacement of their windows, because it was located in the Historic District, and that the property still has the original windows. The owner restored the windows and had used the single-pane historical storm windows over them. Mr. Shaffer noted the deterioration and maintenance costs of these old window, hence the approval for their replacement on the backs and sides the Appleford Inn. Mr. Shaffer stated that for the small number of front windows, the repair cost could be effective.

Ms. Lingle agreed with Mr. Shaffer, and stated that the use of quality historical storm windows can be managed, and that the windows could be repaired. Mr. Goble said that he felt very strongly about the Board's stance on historic structures. He stated that he had personally rebuilt windows. He stated that a good craftsman is vital to the project. He asked if there was egress from the third floor bedroom windows per UCC code and inquired about a fire escape. Mr. Biesecker replied that the third floor building is sprinklered and meets code standards. Mr. Goble suggested that the back windows were replaced in the 1920s to match the style of the front windows and not visa versa.

Mr. Shaffer called for a motion on the revised Certificate of Appropriateness application at 218 Carlisle Street that would replace specifically the front nine windows on the east side of the building used for student housing. In accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for the treatment of historic properties, Mr. Goble made the motion to recommend that Borough Council not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of the front nine windows of the property at 218 Carlisle Street. Ms. Lingle seconded the motion.

Mr. Shaffer recommended that the specific guideline in Item 6, Section 110 of the Historic District Ordinance (Chapter 11 of the Borough Code of Ordinances dealing with matters to be considered by the Board when reviewing applications), outlining the historic authenticity or architectural compatibility of window details, be considered since the window material is original to the building. The fact that these windows could be repaired is the basis of the motion. Mr. Dellett stated that the Board should give the applicant clear direction in how to proceed. Mr. Shaffer replied that the applicant should restore the existing windows, and use the addition of historical storm windows to protect the original window materials and add weather efficiency.

Mr. Shaffer called for a Board vote on the motion that Borough Council not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of the front windows at 218 Carlisle Street. The motion

carried 7-to-0.

Other Business

Mr. Shaffer stated that at this special meeting, the Board cannot consider any additional items at this time. Mr. Dellett stated that the items found in their books are to be considered at next month's meeting.

With no other business before the Board, the Board adjourned the meeting at 7:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen M. Mesher