

June 17, 2015
Historic Architectural Review Board Minutes
Borough of Gettysburg

Chair Gary Shaffer called the Historic Architectural Review Board (HARB) meeting to order at 7:00 PM on Wednesday, June 17, 2015. The meeting was held in Council Chambers of the Borough Building, 59 East High Street. A quorum was present. Those in attendance were: Board members Peggy Gustafson, Joan Hodges, Colleen Lingle, Philip Goble, and Jim McCabe; Scott Dellett, Borough Planning Director; and Karen Mesher, Borough Management Assistant. Also in attendance were: Douglas Miller and Morgan Stocker, both representing 43/45 East Middle Street; Larry Hankey, representing 28 Breckenridge Street; Max Felty of Felty Investments and Nancie Gudmestad, both representing 777 Baltimore Street; R. Clem Malot MCP CFM, of Pennsylvania Municipal Code Alliance, Inc. (PMCA), 405 Wayne Avenue, Chambersburg, PA; and Ron Frenetle, 811 Johns Avenue. The Code Enforcement position was vacant.

Review of Agenda and Minutes

There was one correction to the meeting agenda: changed “43/45 West Middle Street to 43/45 East Middle Street”. Ms. Hodges moved to approve the minutes of the May 20, 2015 meeting. Ms. Gustafson seconded the motion. The **motion** passed, 6-to-0.

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. He asked that the applicants identify themselves for the record before speaking. Borough Council will next meet on Monday, July 13, 2015.

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. COA-15-26 Douglas Miller, 43/45 East Middle Street. Alteration. Replace wood siding with vinyl siding; replace side windows.**

Mr. Dellett presented the *Background Information* as depicted in the Board Memorandum dated June 12, 2015:

BUILDING HISTORY

The two-story Italianate wood frame building, known as the David Ziegler Double House, was built in the spring of 1868, during a population boom that hit the Borough after the

Civil War. The house stands on Lot No. 19, part of the 116-acre tract that James Gettys laid out the Borough in 1785-86.

Ms. Stocker, representing the property owner, gave a brief presentation. Ms. Stocker said that the rear two thirds of the property was replaced with vinyl siding. Mr. Shaffer asked if she was aware that the property was restored under a tax credit rehabilitation, requiring that the siding on the front of the property remain wood. Ms. Stocker was not aware of that. Ms. Hodges said that she would like to see the front clapboard remain wood, and she asked if the windows in the front would be replaced. Ms. Stocker said that the windows are in disrepair and the sills were rotting. She said that the intent is to replace all of the window and siding with vinyl windows and vinyl siding to preserve the integrity of the structure and enhance the property's visual appearance.

Ms. Gustafson asked if she was aware that the property was located in the Historic District, and that it had received a restoration award for the work that was already done to it. Ms. Stocker said no, but she would like to know more of its history. Ms. Gustafson noted that a majority of the windows had Plexiglass or plastic, protecting those windows from the elements. Ms. Stocker said that two of the windows on the first floor were damaged to the point that they could not support air conditioning units. Ms. Gustafson said that parts of the front of the property need attention to prevent further deterioration, and that scraping the paint off the clapboard was possible. Ms. Stocker said that long-term maintenance and high utility costs were considered during the completion of the application, and noted that several properties in the historic district have vinyl.

Mr. Shaffer asked if she understood that the condition of the house is due to the lack of maintenance. Ms. Stocker acknowledged that fact. Mr. Goble said that rehabbing the windows would be their first step, and that wooden windows could be reworked to function properly. He added that storm windows could be added for further protection against the elements. He said that unless the wood clapboard is unrepairable, then it should be restored. He said that many of the properties used vinyl siding prior to the existence of HARB. Mr. Goble said that if the windows are visible from the street, then they must be restored; and stated that there are many local contractors capable of doing the work. Ms. Lingle asked about their intentions for restoring the molding. Ms. Stocker said that she believed that they were not original to the structure. Mr. Shaffer said that the molding was original.

Mr. Shaffer said that the tax credit restoration was approved through the state because it was a commercial project. He said that the investment and compromises made were done to reduce maintenance costs to the property. He suggested that they look to alternatives to what was proposed in the application. He stated that vinyl windows are not approved for the replacement of windows in the Historic District.

Mr. Shaffer presented the Findings of Fact on the entire building:

- The building at 43-45 West Middle 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 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 building is a contributing structure to the Gettysburg Battlefield National 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.”

Mr. Shaffer said that there is relief for the windows located in the back side of the building and those windows facing south. He said that the windows on the front of the building are original to the structure, and they reflect the design intent of an Italianate building constructed around 1868. He stated that the front of the building is an example of exceptional craftsmanship and architectural style of the time. He said that the proposed work is a critical change, and therefore reviewable by the Board. He asked if they want the Board to consider the application as a whole, or to split it to consider the rear windows of the building only. Mr. Miller, the owner of the property, said to consider the application as a whole.

Mr. Miller asked if there was grant money available for the restoration of the building in order to keep it original. Mr. Shaffer said that there has been money available from different organizations in the past as grants or no-interest loans. He said that the Board could help Mr. Miller look into that.

Mr. Miller asked what was rehabbed on the house. Mr. Shaffer said that the rehabilitation work was done as a tax credit to reduce maintenance costs, and that tax money was used to restore the building. He said that the rear side was vinyl as a compromise to reduce maintenance costs, but the front three sides visible to the front were kept as wood. Mr. Shaffer said that the reason that he had asked to split the application was to consider the back windows separately; and that the Board could consider replacing those windows with vinyl because they face south and aren't visible to the public. Ms. Stocker asked if she could get more information on the tax credit rehabilitation. Mr. Shaffer asked if 45 East Middle Street is a commercial rental which could affect future grant applications. Mr. Miller said yes.

Ms. Stocker asked what their next steps should be regarding the siding and the windows. Mr. Shaffer said that, by the Board considering the rear windows as a separate application, they could replace those non-architecturally significant windows now with vinyl siding to reduce maintenance costs. Mr. Shaffer clarified by stating that the windows surrounded by alternate siding are the ones that could be replaced. Mr. Goble stated that the wooden windows could be rehabbed for a reasonable cost.

Mr. Miller asked if the existing vinyl siding could be replaced with vinyl siding. Mr. Shaffer said that an in-kind replacement does not have to go before the Board and can be approved administratively.

Mr. Goble made the **motion** the Board recommends that Borough Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the existing vinyl siding and the windows on the rear of the house at 43/45 East Middle Street where there is vinyl siding already existing. The motion was seconded by Mr. McCabe. The motion carried 6-to-0.

Mr. Shaffer said that in the support of that motion, it should be noted that the rear portion of the building was approved for vinyl siding in a former rehabilitation; and that the siding and windows referenced in the motion are being approved for replacement.

B. COA-15-27 Larry Hankey, 28 Breckenridge Street. Alteration. Replace five windows at the side of the house.

Mr. Dellett presented the *Background Information* as depicted in the Board Memorandum dated June 12, 2015:

DESCRIPTION

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace five windows on the west elevation of the building.

BUILDING HISTORY

According to the Gettysburg Historic Building Survey Committee form prepared in October 1988, initial research indicated that both 26 and 28 Breckenridge Street was built about 1874. However, photographic evidence showed that both building were standing in 1863.

Mr. Shaffer noted that the windows are wood, and that any replacement with vinyl windows would need reviewed by this Board.

Mr. Hankey gave a brief presentation. He said that he wanted to replace five windows on the side of the house, and the windows are not original due to a previous fire. Mr. McCabe asked if the windows were four-over-four in style. Mr. Hankey said yes, and that

the windows are wood with wood sills. Mr. Shaffer said that the wood windows are not original, and that Mr. Hankey is changing materials by using vinyl; therefore the application cannot be approved administratively. Ms. Gustafson asked if the replacement windows would need sills. Mr. Hankey said no, and that the windows are screwed into the brick.

Mr. Shaffer presented the *Findings of Fact*:

- The building at 28 Breckenridge 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 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."

Mr. Shaffer said that the windows being replaced are replacement windows due to a fire.

Mr. Goble made the **motion** the Board recommends Borough Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for 28 Breckenridge Street using the materials as presented in the application dated June 3, 2015 to replace the five windows at the side of the house. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lingle. The motion passed 6-to-0.

Mr. Shaffer recused himself due to a fiduciary relationship with the next applicant, whereby Mr. Goble assumed the role as Chair.

C. COA-15-28 Felty Investments, 777 Baltimore Street. Mural.

Mr. Dellett presented the *Background Information* as depicted in the Board Memorandum dated June 12, 2015:

DESCRIPTION

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness to paint "National Soldiers Orphanage Homestead onto the brick on the north side of the building.

BUILDING HISTORY

Mr. Dellett stated that a copy of the 1989 Historic Resource Survey Form for the property is included with this memorandum and is too lengthy to read.

Mr. Goble read the **Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for the Treatment of Historic Buildings**, noting the guidelines that are not recommended:

The following are recommendations for restoration of masonry building exteriors:

- Inspecting painted masonry surfaces to determine whether repainting is necessary.
- Removing damaged or deteriorated paint only to the next sound layer using the gentlest method possible (e.g., hand scraping) prior to repainting.
- Applying compatible paint coating systems following proper surface preparation.
- Repainting with colors that are documented to the restoration period of the building.

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

- Applying paint or other coatings such as stucco to masonry that has been historically unpainted or uncoated to create a new appearance.
- Removing paint from historically painted masonry.
- Radically changing the type of paint or coating or its color.

Ms. Gudmestad gave a brief presentation on behalf of the applicant. She said that the project would enhance Baltimore Street, and involved the painting of murals on the sides of buildings depicting their heritage and function from the 1800 (e.g. highlighting Mr. Shriver's house and that it was a saloon). She said that the murals would be similar to the ones done in Frederick, MD. She said that local artist Marty Mummert, who specializes in painting old signs on the sides of buildings, would paint the murals. She said that these murals aren't advertising signs, but artwork.

Mr. Dellet said that the Board has reviewed murals, like the one painted on Plank's Garage on North Stratton Street. Ms. Hodges said that she did not favor painting directly on the brick, and asked about painting on a sign instead. Ms. Gudmestad said the scope of the project would be limited to Baltimore Street from Lincoln Square to 777 Baltimore Street, and that the signs would be readable from the street. Ms. Gustafson asked if the murals would be sized by the dimension of the bricks on these buildings, and would the windows and downspouts be taken into consideration when painting these murals. Mr.

Felty said that perhaps a four-foot by eight-foot sign on the side of his building would make sense. Ms. Gudmestad said that these signs would be painted in an old fashioned style and not ever on the front of a building. She said that these murals are supposed to be art that gives a shadow of history. Mr. Goble asked if these murals contradict the sign ordinance. Mr. Dellett said no, and that they are not advertising a business. Ms. Gudmestad said that these murals would suggest the former use of the buildings, and can be seen by walking down the street. She said that examples of Mr. Mummert's artwork could be seen at the Gettysburg Heritage Center.

Mr. Goble asked if the applicants could get the Board more information, and show a rendering of what the artwork on the buildings would look like. Mr. Dellett suggested tabling the application pending more information such as: the location of murals, the placement of murals on the buildings, and an alternative to placing murals on the brick. Ms. Gudmestad asked if they would need approval to paint on weathered boards mounted on brick. Mr. Goble said that you could either make the motion to table or withdraw the application. Ms. Gudmestad said that she would withdraw the application, and that she did not want the building owners to bare any cost. Mr. Goble said that the Board is open to the idea, but needs more information.

Mr. Felty withdrew his application.

Mr. Shaffer resumed his role as Chair.

Mr. Shaffer noted that buildings in the 1800s were painted because people did not accept the look of raw brick, which was considered lower class. He said that this is exemplified by the Old High Street School and the Old Adams County Courthouse.

New Business

Mr. Shaffer introduced R. Clem Malot, MCP CFM as the Borough Code Official (BCO) for Gettysburg Borough. He said that his company is PA Code Alliance, Inc. from Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, and that he does commercial code inspections of buildings. He said that Mr. Malot sits on the HARB Boards in both Mercersburg and Bedford Boroughs as their BCO.

Reports

A. Administrative Approvals

Mr. Dellett said that there were no administrative approvals since the last meeting.

B. Planning Director

- Mr. Dellett said that he and Mr. Shaffer met with representatives from the Civil War Trust last week regarding the resubmission of their application. He asked if

the Board would consider holding a special meeting, possibly in September, to focus on their application at 401 Buford Avenue. Many Board Members liked the idea of a special meeting. Mr. Shaffer said the Trust had a great deal of respect for the Historic District ordinance, and understood that the ordinance protects the buildings. He said that we may have the power to stop the demolition, but cannot compel the use of their buildings. He noted that the value in those buildings is not just in their structures, but in their uses. Mr. Goble said that there still cannot be demolition by neglect, and that they do have to maintain it even if they are not occupied. Mr. McCabe asked if the buildings had been inspected. Mr. Shaffer said that a report by a structural engineer would be needed to determine the soundness of the buildings. He said the Trust stated that their buildings are sound; but it is the use of the site that they are questioning.

- Mr. Dellett said that the 58/60 Breckenridge Street application should be on the agenda for next month.

Other Business

Ms. Gustafson said that Anna J. Moyer appreciated all of the Board's input and support regarding the porch repair at her property.

With no other business before the Board, the Board adjourned the meeting at 8:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Karen M. Mesher
Borough Management Assistant