

November 20, 2013
Historic Architectural Review Board Minutes
Gettysburg Borough

Chairman Gary Shaffer called the Historic Architectural Review Board to order at 7:31 p.m. on Wednesday, November 20, 2013. The meeting was held at the Borough Building, 59 East High Street. A quorum was present. Those in attendance were: Board members Jim McCabe, Philip Goble, Peggy Gustafson Aubrey Burkholder, Borough Code Enforcement Officer; and Scott Dellett, Borough Planning Director. Board Members Colleen Lingle and Nancie Gudmestad were absent. Bob Crouthamel of Crouthamel Construction Co., representing Trinity United Church of Christ, 141 South Stratton Street, was in attendance.

Review of Agenda and Minutes

There were no additions or corrections to the meeting agenda. Mr. Goble moved to approve the minutes of the October 16, 2013 and October 28, 2013 meetings. Ms. Gustafson seconded the motion. The motion passed, 5 to 0.

Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda

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

Application for Certificates of Appropriateness

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 final decisions concerning the issuance of Certificates of Appropriateness. Borough Council will next meet on Monday, December 9, 2013.

Trinity United Church of Christ, 141 South Stratton Street.

Mr. Dellett presented the background information on the application, as depicted in the Board Memorandum dated November 15, 2013:

DESCRIPTION

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows at the parsonage.

BUILDING HISTORY

The property includes the church, built in 1851 as a two-story brick building with a basement and audience room and gallery. During the Battle of Gettysburg in 1863, the church served as a hospital for wounded soldiers of both armies. The building also served as a "Y" hut for Camp Colt soldiers during World War I. The addition of a Fellowship Hall was completed in 1950.

During the congregation's bicentennial celebration in 1990, the church renovated the building, including remodeling and realigning the interior of the sanctuary, adding the chancel and gathering area, parlor, and offices, and remodeling of the Fellowship Hall and church school classrooms.

The area where the Church's parsonage stands was the site of the cemetery formerly known as the German Reformed & Lutheran Cemetery of Gettysburg; a plot plan was prepared in 1921 shortly before the cemetery was disinterred and moved to Evergreen Cemetery. The parsonage was built between 1924 and 1931; the building first appeared on the Borough's 1931 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map.

PREVIOUS APPROVALS

Borough Council approved the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for alterations to the soffit, fascia, gutter and siding for the parsonage at 141 South Stratton Street in July 1989. Construction of a shed was approved by Council in August 2013.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR'S GUIDELINES FOR THE TREATMENT OF HISTORIC PROPERTIES

The following are recommendations for windows:

- Identifying, retaining, and preserving windows—and their functional and decorative features—that are important in defining the overall historic character of the building. Such features can include frames, sash, muntins, glazing, sills, heads, hoodmolds, panelled or decorated jambs and moldings, and interior and exterior shutters and blinds.
- Conducting an in-depth survey of the condition of existing windows early in preservation planning so that repair and upgrading methods and possible replacement options can be fully explored.
- Stabilizing deteriorated or damaged windows as a preliminary measure, when necessary, prior to undertaking appropriate preservation work.
- Protecting and maintaining the wood and architectural metals which comprise the window frame, sash, muntins, and surrounds through appropriate surface treatments such as cleaning, rust removal, limited paint removal, and reapplication of protective coating systems.
- Making windows weathertight by re-caulking and replacing or installing weatherstripping. These actions also improve thermal efficiency.
- Evaluating the existing condition of materials to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, i.e. if repairs to windows and window features will be required.

- Repairing window frames and sash by patching, piecing-in, consolidating or otherwise reinforcing them using recognized preservation methods. The new work should be unobtrusively dated to guide future research and treatment.

The following are not recommended, according to the Secretary of the Interior's guidelines:

- Altering windows or window features which are important in defining the historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.
- Changing the historic appearance of windows by replacing materials, finishes, or colors which noticeably change the sash, depth of reveal, and muntin configuration; the reflectivity and color of the glazing; or the appearance of the frame.
- Obscuring historic window trim with metal or other material.
- Replacing windows solely because of peeling paint, broken glass, stuck sash, and high air infiltration. These conditions, in themselves, are no indication that windows are beyond repair.
- Failing to stabilize a deteriorated or damaged window until additional work is undertaken, thus allowing further damage to occur to the historic building.
- Failing to provide adequate protection of materials on a cyclical basis so that deterioration of the window results.
- Retrofitting or replacing windows rather than maintaining the sash, frame, and glazing.
- Failing to undertake adequate measures to assure the protection of historic windows.
- Failing to protect the historic glazing when repairing windows.
- Removing material that could be repaired, using improper repair techniques, or failing to document the new work.
- Failing to reuse serviceable window hardware such as brass sash lifts and sash locks.

GETTYSBURG DESIGN GUIDE

The Gettysburg Design Guide provides guidelines for windows:

Windows are among the most prominent features of buildings in the Borough. Windows typically comprise about 20 to 30 percent of a historic building's surface area and they act as

both interior and exterior elements. Significant parts of windows include their materials and shape, panel and pane arrangement, moldings, hoods, fanlights and sidelights.

Windows are significant and should be retained if they:

- Are original.
- Reflect the original design intent of the building.
- Reflect period or regional styles or building practices.
- Reflect changes to the building from major events.
- Are examples of exceptional craftsmanship or design.

If it has been determined that a window is beyond repair and must be replaced, the type of replacement unit must be selected. Below are the options:

- First Choice: Choose replacement windows that fit the original opening exactly and match the original units in material type, glass color and reflectivity, and:
 - o Overall size
 - o Shape
 - o Number of panes
 - o Arrangement of panes
 - o Type of operation
 - o Component size (frames, muntins)
 - o Decorative details.
- Second Choice: Choose windows of a compatible material that match all the other design details of the original.

Mr. Shaffer asked Mr. Crouthamel to clarify the proposed work stated in the application. Mr. Crouthamel said he had done work over the church for the last couple years. He added that the church asked him to provide price for replacement for a vinyl replacement windows and he was unaware the building was in the Historic District. The church wishes to replace all the windows in the building. An older patio door was also being replaced. Mr. Crouthamel showed the sample of the replacement vinyl window. He said the windows would be six-over-one with grills on the top sash. The existing window frames are in reasonably good shape. The storm windows do not work well, he said. A few windows are six-over-one; the other windows are one-over-one. The condition of the existing windows is fair, Mr. Crouthamel said. The sills are not rotting and the frames are in decent shape, he added. The wider windows that are eight-over-one would remain eight-over-one, Mr. Crouthamel said.

Responding to a question by Mr. McCabe, Mr. Crouthamel said a number of the windows would be one-over-one and the church wished to have grills on the upper side. Mr. Crouthamel said there have been alterations to the building. Mr. Shaffer said if he

remembered correctly, there was a one-story wing at the south elevation of the building. When an addition to the historic church was built in the early 1980s, the wing was removed and the frame addition was moved to the north elevation. There are a couple of one-over-one windows on the south side are replacements, Mr. Shaffer said. He added the other windows in the Greek Revival Colonial home are multi-pane over single-pane windows. The south side windows were modified because that side of the building was modified, Mr. Shaffer said.

Ms. Gustafson asked if the other side windows are vinyl. Mr. Crouthamel confirmed the proposed windows would be vinyl. Ms. Gustafson said if locks were placed on the windows they would be storm tight. Mr. Crouthamel said the church representatives should respond to some of the Board's questions. Replacement windows, properly installed with installed glass, are better, Mr. Crouthamel said; however, he could not compare with the existing windows. The storm panels that were likely installed in the 1960s would be removed, he said. Mr. Crouthamel said it is his assumption that the church is looking for windows that are energy efficient and reduce maintenance.

Ms. Gustafson asked if the windows on front part of the building are multi-paned on the top would they remain as eight-over-one; Mr. Crouthamel said they would be remain. Ms. Gustafson asked since the front is most visible and the church wants something that is more energy-efficient, would the church consider having the dividers on the outside. Mr. Crouthamel said manufacturers offer windows that have dividers applied to the outside of the window.

Mr. Crouthamel said he was at the meeting to present the proposed replacement windows. If the Board said the grills must be applied to the glass, the additional cost for the windows would be minimal. Mr. Crouthamel said the church may consider other suggestions regarding the replacement windows. Mr. Crouthamel said the church's objective is not to have paint on the inside or outside of the window. The trim on the inside and outside of the windows would remain, he said.

Mr. Crouthamel said church representatives did not discuss the issue of painting panes. He said he was directed to come up with a cost estimate for windows; he was not aware the window replacement required approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Goble asked if the church considered repairing the windows. Mr. Crouthamel said church representatives never discussed that option. Mr. Goble said a representative from the church shall come before the Board to answer questions. Mr. Goble said a well-rehabilitated wooden window would work. He asked if the windows are beyond repair. Mr. Crouthamel said he could not say they were beyond repair Mr. Goble suggested the Board table the application. Mr. Shaffer said he would prefer to reject the application with specific reasons they would have for consideration of what the Board is looking for. Mr. Goble said they have not given any alternatives. Mr. Shaffer said the Board does not accept vinyl replacement windows unless it is at the rear or non-primary elevations of the building.

Mr. Goble agreed the Board should reject elevation. He added he would not object to vinyl replacement windows on the south elevation, but not on the north, east and west elevations. Mr. Crouthamel said he would be happy to review the condition of the existing windows with the church.

Mr. Shaffer said his issue with tabling the application is the time limits for the issuance of building permits, and the Certificate of Appropriateness permit would fall under those time limits. Ms. Gustafson said if the Board rejects the application, it would give them more time to consider options.

Mr. Shaffer requested a motion that the Board recommends Borough Council deny the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness unless the Church asked for the application to be withdrawn. Mr. Shaffer said the reason for the recommendation of denial is that wood windows located on primary elevations of a building that are not deteriorated and that can be restored under U.S. Department of Interior guidelines for treatment of windows on historic properties and that are protected by storm sash should not be replaced. In the event that windows in non-primary building elevations are replaced, they can be replaced with a vinyl covered replacement window, but generally not a vinyl window within a window. Any replacement window on a primary elevation need to have a grill that provides the exterior shadow line. Mr. Goble said it would be the north, east and west building elevations; Mr. Shaffer agreed.

Ms. Gustafson said the church shall receive the Board memorandum and have the opportunity to withdraw the application as part of the motion.

Mr. Shaffer presented the Findings of Fact:

- The building at 141 South Stratton 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 has been standing since at least 1931. The core of the building has a great deal of integrity, although additions have modified the original building.
- The proposed work constitute a permanent change, making this proposal a critical project, which is defined in the Historic District 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."

Ms. Gustafson moved the Board recommended Council deny the issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application. Ms. Goble seconded the motion. Mr. Shaffer said the South Stratton Street building is similar in age as the building at Gettysburg College that the

Board reviewed earlier this year, where the Board would not approve vinyl replacement windows. The motion passed, 5-0.

Mr. Shaffer suggested the church consider withdrawing the application before it goes before Council.

Reports

Mr. Dellett had no report for the Board.

Other Business

Mr. Shaffer noted the Board received four applications for the November meeting; three of the applications were roof replacement. Mr. Shaffer said he and Mr. Dellett reviewed the applications and properties and determined the projects were replacement in kind. Two of the roofs were replacement of existing asphalt roofs; the third roof was a replacement of existing black slate roof with a black slate roof. Mr. Shaffer said if there is anything that changes the building's appearance, the application will be brought before the Board. If the replacement is a similar look, it will be approved administratively.

Mr. Dellett said if it is the Board's wishes, he could provide information on applications that are administratively approved. Mr. Goble suggested that information be inserted into the Board's meeting binders.

The Board adjourned the meeting at 8:13 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Scott Dellett", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Scott Dellett, AICP
Borough Planning Director