

April 15, 2015
Historic Architectural Review Board Minutes
Borough of Gettysburg

Chair Gary Shaffer called the Historic Architectural Review Board meeting to order at 7:04 PM on Wednesday, April 15, 2015. The meeting was held at the Borough Municipal Building, 59 East High Street. A quorum was present. Those in attendance were: Board members Philip Goble, Peggy Gustafson, Joan Hodges, Colleen Lingle, and Jim McCabe and Aubrey Burkholder, Borough Code Enforcement Officer; Scott Dellett, Borough Planning Director; and Karen Mesher, Borough Management Assistant. Also in attendance were: Jim Biesecker and William Baldwin of Gettysburg College representing 239 Carlisle Street; Frank Stroik representing Mark and Heidi Kile of The Country Homestead, 323 Baltimore Street; Joe Edgar of Shaffer Design Associates, PC representing Steven and Pat Nevada 158-160 East Middle Street; and Jair Barr, representing 105 East Middle Street.

Review of Agenda and Minutes

There were no additions or corrections to the meeting agenda. Mr. Dellett said that a revised agenda was sent to Board Members prior to tonight's meeting to clarify the application at 105 East Middle Street. Mr. Goble moved to approve the minutes of the March 18, 2015 meeting with the following correction: remove Ms. Gustafson and replace with Mr. McCabe (upon further review of the minutes) on page 1 as the second for the approval of the minutes. Ms. Lingle seconded the motion. The **motion** passed, 7-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

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, May 11, 2015.

- **COA-15-11 Gettysburg and Northern Railroad, 106 North Washington Street. Alteration. Replace existing tar roof with architectural shingles.**

Mr. Dellett asked to table the application of the property owned by Gettysburg College until the College, the applicant and the contractor could meet. Mr. Goble made the **motion** to table this application until it can be properly submitted. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gustafson. The motion passed 7-to-0.

- **COA-15-12 Gettysburg College, 239 Carlisle Street. Alteration. Replace windows at the side and rear elevation of the building.**

Mr. Dellett presented the *Background Information* as depicted in the Board Memorandum dated April 14, 2015:

DESCRIPTION

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace windows at the side and rear elevations of the building.

BUILDING HISTORY

As noted in the applicant's narrative, the two-story Italianate Colonial Revival was built in 1871 as the residence for Rev. Edward Bridenbaugh. Typical of the Italianate Style, this building and others on Carlisle Street feature elongated two-over-two window sash. After Rev. Bridenbaugh's residency, the property evolved into a multi-family dwelling. The property was acquired by Gettysburg College in 1988 and is presently used as special interest student housing.

PREVIOUS APPROVALS

A Certificate of Appropriateness application for door replacement was administratively approved in June 2012 as part of interior and exterior renovations to the building to comply with ADA requirements.

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, paneled 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 weather tight by re-caulking and replacing or installing weather stripping. 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* discusses the significance of windows and doors in Gettysburg. Windows and doors are among the most prominent features of buildings. Windows typically comprise 20 to 30 percent of a historic building's façade, and they act as both interior and exterior elements. Significant parts of doors and windows include their materials and shape, panel and pane arrangements, moldings, hoods, fanlights and sidelights.

Windows and doors receive consistently hard use, but they are so thoroughly integrated into the structure of a building that complete replacement is rarely advisable. Repair and weatherization are more often practical and economical than most property owners realize.

According to the *Gettysburg Design Guide*, windows are significant and should be retained if they:

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

Once it has been determined that a door is beyond repair and must be replaced, the type of replacement unit must be selected.

Options:

1. First Choice: Choose replacement windows that fit the original opening exactly and match the original units in material type, glass color and reflectivity; and
2. Second Choice: Choose windows of a compatible material that match all the other design details of the original.

Mr. Biesecker, Director of Facilities Planning Management at Gettysburg College, and Mr. Baldwin, Project Manager at Gettysburg College, gave a brief presentation. Mr. Biesecker said that Gettysburg College has owned the property since 1988 and it is currently used as student housing. He said that the intention is to replace the windows on the North, South and East side of the house and not on the street-front. There are maintenance issues and energy efficiency issues associated with these windows. Mr. Baldwin stated that these are the same type of windows that were used in the past.

Ms. Hodges asked if these windows are double pane windows and are you planning on putting storms on them. Mr. Baldwin said yes to the double pane windows, but no to the storm windows. Mr. McCabe asked if anything will be done to the detailing when replacing the windows. Mr. Baldwin said that they are just replacing the windows and that the outside will look the same. Mr. Goble asked if the windows were currently wooden. Mr. Baldwin replied yes, and that they are difficult to operate. There is plaster over the brick interior, so they are difficult to insulate. Mr. Goble said that if the windows are reasonable good windows, then they need to be reworked and storms used. He asked if the windows could be reworked with new weights and sashes. Mr. Biesecker said that the window issues have been addressed, but they have been difficult to maintain. Ms. Lingle was concerned about maintaining the bay window, and feels wood windows should remain and be reworked. Ms. Gustafson asked if the bay window is part of the student living area, will the windows be padded in, and if the College would consider getting a better storm window on the bay window. Mr. Biesecker said that the storm windows have never been replaced, and it is not their intention to pad the windows. Mr. Baldwin replies yes to getting a better storm window on the bay window.

Ms. Hodges asked if these windows are replacement windows of replacement windows. Mr. Baldwin said that they are old windows, but not the original windows. Mr. Shaffer asked if the front windows are the original two over two windows. Mr. Baldwin said that it is believed that the front windows are original windows. Mr. Shaffer said that the structure is a W. C. Stahlsmith building, and that this is an opportunity to speak to an extraordinary builder.

Mr. McCabe made the **motion** that the Board recommends Borough Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of the windows as stated in the application dated April 1, 2015 with the exception of the bay window on the first floor southwest corner of the south side, and that it be maintained with a storm window. Ms. Hodges seconded the motion. Ms. Lingle asked if there was a way to determine if the windows were original to the house. Mr. Goble feels that the side and back windows were not original. In a roll-call vote, Ms. Hodges, Mr. Shaffer, Ms. Gustafson and Mr. McCabe voted in favor of the recommendation; Mr. Goble, Ms. Lingle and Mr. Burkholder voted against recommendation of the replacement windows. Mr. Shaffer noted that the motion passed 4-to-3 in favor of the motion. He asked that the board members who voted against the motion indicate their reason. Mr. Goble was not

convinced that the windows are not original windows and that they fall within the *Secretary of Interior Guidelines*. Ms. Lingle agreed, and believes that they are the original windows and can be reworked, preserved and not removed. Mr. Burkholder said it is not evident that the windows are rotten and not repairable.

Mr. Shaffer stated that it will go to Council with a divided vote and could be kicked out of the consent agenda; but a reapplication would not meet the refiling deadline of May 6th to make the June HARB meeting. Council generally accepts the recommendation of this Board, but they look closely at divided votes.

- **COA-15-13 Mark and Heidi Kile, 323 Baltimore Street. Demolition. Demolish rear garage, remove portable car port and remove storage sheds.**

Mr. presented the *Background Information* as depicted in the Board Memorandum dated April 14, 2015:

DESCRIPTION

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness to remove the rear garage, back shed and shed on the back of the house.

BUILDING HISTORY

Known as the Henry Garlach House/Cabinet Shop Building, the original house at 323 Baltimore Street is a two-story brick simple Georgian. According to a survey prepared by Gerald R. Bennett in January 1992, which is included in the application materials:

- The original house was built in 1820;
- Kitchen and shop additions were built in 1855;
- Additions to the shop area and conversion to dwelling units occurred in 1891; and
- Addition of one-story rear room to Lot No. 1 (323 Baltimore Street) was built in 1905.

GETTYSBURG DESIGN GUIDE

The following discusses outbuildings:

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 or detailing.
- The outbuilding possesses a strong relationship in 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. Stroik, Contractor with The Country Homestead, represented the applicants and gave a brief presentation. He said that the shed is beyond repair, the floor is below grade and rotten, and requested the removal of the concrete pad. It was inspected by Steve Ehly. Mr. Stroik noted that the shed shares a common wall with a neighbor.

Mr. Shaffer said that the applicant is looking at just a demolition and not a reconstruction. Ms. Gustafson asked for the clarification of the presented pictures, noting the car port and frame shed. Mr. McCabe asked if the new addition would affect the neighbor. Mr. Stroik said that he would replace the neighbor's siding and there would be a three foot difference. Ms. Gustafson asked if the house shed addition is connected to the neighbor's house. Mr. Stroik responded no. Mr. McCabe asked if the storage shed is a newer shed. Mr. Stroik believed it to be from the early 1900's.

Mr. Goble made a **motion** that the Board recommends Borough Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed demolition of the structures to the rear of the house as depicted in the application dated April 1, 2015. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lingle. The motion carried 7-to-0.

Mr. Shaffer recused himself due to a fiduciary relationship with the applicants, whereby Mr. Goble assumed the role as Vice-Chair.

D. COA-15-14 Steve Nevada, 154-158-160 East Middle Street. Alteration. Remove existing tin roof from the main house and replace with GAF Timberline Ultra HD Shingles; replace existing rubber roof on the flat roof; install aluminum seamless gutters and downspouts

on all sections of the house. New Construction and Demolition. Demolish rear porch enclosure and rebuild on the same footprint.

Mr. Dellett presented the *Background Information* as depicted in the Board Memo dated April 15, 2015:

DESCRIPTION

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following:

- Alteration. Remove existing tin roof from the main house and replace with GAF Timberline Ultra HD Shingles; replace existing rubber roof on the flat roof; install aluminum seamless gutters and downspouts on all sections of the house.
- New Construction and Demolition. Demolish rear porch enclosure and rebuild on the same footprint.

BUILDING HISTORY

The two-story structure first appeared on the 1912 Borough Sanborn Fire Insurance maps. The configuration of the principal structure was the same in the 1931 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map. The rear porch did not appear in either the 1912 or 1931 maps.

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

The following are recommendations for the rehabilitation and restoration of roofs:

- Identifying, retaining, and preserving roofs and roof features from the restoration period. This includes the roof's shape, such as hipped, gambrel, and mansard; decorative features such as cupolas, cresting, chimneys, and weathervanes; and roofing material such as slate, wood, clay tile, and metal, as well as size, color, and patterning.
- *Protecting and maintaining* a restoration period roof by cleaning the gutters and downspouts and replacing deteriorated flashing. Roof sheathing should also be checked for proper venting to prevent moisture condensation and water penetration; and to insure that materials are free from insect infestation.
- Providing adequate anchorage for roofing material to guard against wind damage and moisture penetration.
- Protecting a leaking roof with plywood and building paper until it can be properly repaired.

- Evaluating the existing condition of materials to determine whether more than protection and maintenance are required, that is, if repairs to roofs and roof features will be necessary.
- *Repairing* a roof from the restoration period by reinforcing the materials which comprise roof features. Repairs will also generally include the limited replacement in kind—or with compatible substitute material — of those extensively deteriorated or missing parts of features when there are surviving prototypes such as cupola louvers, dentils, dormer roofing; or slates, tiles, or wood shingles. The new work should be unobtrusively dated to guide future research and treatment.
- Replacing in kind an entire feature of the roof that is too deteriorated to repair—if the overall form and detailing are still evident — using the physical evidence as a model to reproduce the feature. Examples can include a large section of roofing, or a dormer or chimney. If using the same kind of material is not technically or economically feasible, then a compatible substitute material may be considered.

The following is not recommended:

- Radically changing, damaging, or destroying roofs which are important in defining the overall historic character of the building so that, as a result, the character is diminished.
- Removing a major portion of the roof or roofing material that is repairable, then reconstructing it with new material in order to create a uniform, or “improved” appearance.
- Changing the configuration of a roof by adding new features such as dormer windows, vents, or skylights so that the historic character is diminished.
- Stripping the roof of sound historic material such as slate, clay tile, wood, and architectural metal.
- Applying paint or other coatings to roofing material which has been historically uncoated.
- Failing to clean and maintain gutters and downspouts properly so that water and debris collect and cause damage to roof fasteners, sheathing, and the underlying structure.
- Allowing roof fasteners, such as nails and clips to corrode so that roofing material is subject to accelerated deterioration.
- Permitting a leaking roof to remain unprotected so that accelerated deterioration of historic building materials — masonry, wood, plaster, paint and structural members — occurs.

GETTYSBURG DESIGN GUIDE

The following are options for roofing, according to the *Design Guide*:

- **First Choice:** Clean and maintain gutters, downspouts and flashing. Reattach loose shingles. Ensure that nails and other fasteners are secure and without corrosion. Fill small cracks in sheet metal with caulk or sealant – a temporary repair.
- **Second Choice:** If less than 20 percent of the slate or wood shingles on one slope are damaged, replace the damaged or missing shingles with new shingles that match the original in material, size, shape, color and other visual characteristics.
- **Third Choice:** Replace damaged or missing roofing material with new material that matches the original on the prominent portions of the roof. Replace with a compatible substitute material in less prominent areas. If the roofing substrate will be replaced, be sure to re-use original undamaged material when re-roofing.
- **Fourth Choice:** If new shingles in the original material cannot be obtained, replace missing shingles with new shingles in a substitute material that conveys the same visual appearance as the original shingles. If the original shingles were varied in color, attempt to reproduce this historic color variety. If the original type of sheet metal cannot be obtained, replace the original with new sheet metal that conveys the same visual characteristics as the original.

The following are guidelines regarding demolition of parts of buildings, according to the *Design Guide*:

Demolition of any part of a building requires a permit and, because all parts of a building contribute to the overall character of the building, demolition in part is rarely advisable. This type of demolition may be appropriate when the building element:

- Is deteriorated beyond repair;
- Is in danger of collapse;
- Cannot be stabilized; and
- Only after it has been thoroughly documented.

Removal of building elements is not acceptable if an appropriate replacement will not be constructed. If any building elements are removed, they should be recorded on photos prior to removal and should be stored for future use.

Mr. Edgar of Shaffer Design Associates, PC gave a brief presentation on the first part of the application, replacing the tin roof. He stated that the applicant of the property at 158-160 east Middle Street would like to remove the tin roof and replace it with GAF Timberline shingles. He would also like to replace the rubber roof on the flat roof addition to the rear, and to install aluminum seamless gutters and downspouts on all sections of the house.

Ms. Lingle stated that the tin roof does not look all that bad, and would he consider repairing it or using a metal roof. Mr. Nevada said that the roof has holes and is pitted.

Mrs. Nevada said that the house was built in 1938, and that they wanted to match the other roofs on the street. Ms. Lingle said that she liked the snowbirds and that their roof represents a really unique roof. Mr. Nevada said that the attic is splintering and that they could not nail into it. He noted that they looked into a neutral color.

Ms. Gustafson said that a standing seam metal roof looks attractive, and if it would save cost, would you consider it. Mr. Edgar said that the proposed shingles are 50-year shingles. Mr. Nevada said that they bid a standing seam roof and at a good grade. Mr. McCabe said that metal roofs can be attractive and add beauty to the house. Mr. Edgar said that a metal roof was guaranteed for ten years, and that shingles were guaranteed for fifty years. Mr. Goble asked noted the cost difference and that lathing would have to be added.

Mr. Goble made the **motion** that the Board recommend that Borough Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness as depicted in the proposed plans from the application dated April 1, 2015 to replace the flat roofs in kind with rubber roofs and the main roof with a standing seam metal roof at 158-160 East Middle Street. The motion was seconded by Mr. McCabe. The motion passed 7-to-0.

Mr. Edgar presented the second part of the application, demolishing the rear porch enclosure and rebuild on the same footprint. He said that the existing rear porch is infilled and is pulling away from the house and sinking. He proposed to replace the porch, and there would no longer be a door but windows.

Ms. Gustafson asked if there was another door. Mr. Nevada confirmed there was another rear door.

Ms. Gustafson made the **motion** that the Board recommends Borough Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness as depicted in the proposed plans from the application dated April 1, 2015 to replace the rear porch at 160 East Middle Street. The motion was seconded by Ms. Lingle. The motion passed 7-to-0.

E. COA-15-15 JGQ Properties, 105 East Middle Street. Alteration. Replace existing windows with new windows on the side and back.

Mr. Dellett presented the *Background Information* as depicted in the Board Memorandum dated April 14, 2015:

DESCRIPTION

The applicant requests a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of windows at the rear and side elevations.

BUILDING HISTORY

The Italianate style came into the Borough just before the Civil War, the turning point in Gettysburg's history. Not only did the Battle of Gettysburg make the community known to the world, it altered the local economy. Though the town continued its

manufacturing, especially furniture, tourism provided its greatest source of economic expansion. The Borough had a growing middle class and increased wealth. Larger homes, churches and commercial buildings emerged and several new neighborhoods developed. Italianate had a flexibility that continued to serve the Borough's changing fortunes.

The house at 105 East Middle Street demonstrates a variation of the Italianate style popularly known as the French Second Empire style, which was embraced throughout the United States. These buildings had Italianate features plus a mansard roof, which provided an additional story under a steeply sloped roof, thereby diminishing visually the massiveness of the building. The building was constructed in 1870.

PREVIOUS APPROVALS

A Certificate of Appropriateness application for door replacement was administratively approved in June 2012 as part of interior and exterior renovations to the building to comply with ADA requirements.

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, paneled 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 weather tight by re-caulking and replacing or installing weather stripping. 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* discusses the significance of windows in Gettysburg. Windows and doors are among the most prominent features of buildings. Windows typically comprise 20 to 30 percent of a historic building's façade, and they act as both interior and exterior elements. Significant parts of doors and windows include their materials and shape, panel and pane arrangements, moldings, hoods, fanlights and sidelights.

Windows and doors receive consistently hard use, but they are so thoroughly integrated into the structure of a building that complete replacement is rarely advisable. Repair and weatherization are more often practical and economical than most property owners realize.

According to the *Gettysburg Design Guide*, windows are significant and should be retained if they:

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

Once it has been determined that a door is beyond repair and must be replaced, the type of replacement unit must be selected.

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
- Second Choice: Choose windows of a compatible material that match all the other design details of the original.

Mr. Barr gave a brief presentation. He said that he had already demolished the back building; removed the slate roof and replaced it with Echo Star plastic shingles. He said that he replaced all the wood with white wood and that he had no desire to replace the front windows. He said that he would like to rework the front wood windows and use Birch storm windows in the front. Mr. Barr said he would like to replace the windows on the side and rear for all three floors with vinyl side windows.

Ms. Lingle asked he had replaced the windows on the one side to avoid insurance cancellation. Ms. Gustafson said that the windows were not visible from the street, and

asked that how many of the windows that were removed had colored glass. He replied that none of the removed windows had colored glass. She clarified that all of the windows that had colored glass would remain. Mr. Barr replied yes to replacing the side windows at the insistence of his insurance company. Ms. Gustafson asked if all of the windows will match and would be painted white. Mr. Goble had asked if the majority of the windows were replaced. Mr. Barr said that the windows were purchased. Mr. Goble asked if the colored glass windows would remain. Mr. Dellett suggested that staff inventory the colored glass windows. Mr. Goble noted that his insurance company pressured him to replace the windows, and that there should be a procedure for an emergency session to address these situations.

Mr. Goble made the **motion** that the Board recommends Borough Council issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to replace the windows on the side and rear of 105 East Middle Street as depicted in the application dated March 30, 2015 with the exception of any window with colored glass, and direct staff to inventory those windows for future record. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hodges. The motion passed 7-to-0.

Mr. Goble stated that there should be a procedure to address this issue. Mr. Dellett said that there should be some sort of proof from the insurance company, so that it could be approved administratively. Mr. Goble suggested calling a special HARB meeting. Mr. Dellett said that we could not do anything without approval from Council. Mr. Goble suggested amending the ordinance to grant special emergency approval, and we need a procedure to deal with this. We cannot place the home owner in a precarious situation. Mr. Shaffer said that HARB cannot preapprove things, but we could approve things administratively in emergency situations like in a fire. Mr. Goble said that we need to formulate procedures for administrative procedures in emergency situations. Mr. Shaffer said that you do not have to accept work just because it was done, and still could review it as if it was a new application. Mr. Burkholder said that homeowner's insurance costs have come down, but the risk tolerance has also come down. Mr. Dellett said that the Board needs both flexibility and accountability. Mr. Shaffer said that we could adjust the rules that the Board operates under instead of adjusting the ordinance.

Mr. Shaffer resumed his role as Chair.

New Business

Mr. Dellett discussed the 2015 Historic Preservation Awards. He said staff prepared a summary of all of the properties submitted for this year's awards based on the Board's recommendations as depicted in his Board Memorandum dated April 15, 2015:

Based on the discussion at the March 18, 2015 meeting, the following applications have been nominated for the 2015 Historic Preservation Awards:

Certificate of Exceptional Merit:

- 221 South Washington Street.

Certificate of Merit:

- 208 Baltimore Street

Honorable Mention:

- 400 Baltimore Street
- 117 York Street
- 18 Carlisle Street

Please let me know if I have left a nominee off this list or if you have any additional properties for consideration. The presentation is scheduled for May 11th.

CLG Grant

Mr. Dellett said that the next training for HARB members will be on April 29th from 4:30 PM to 9 PM with Preservation PA, and that the invitation for this training be extended to Council, Staff and Jim Hale and Alex Hayes from the *Gettysburg Times*. Mr. Shaffer said that invitations were sent to the candidates for Borough Council, and to Cumberland Township's Historic Architectural Review Board.

Mr. Dellett said that HARB is the recipient of the extension of CLG Grant totaling \$23,560, and the Borough's contribution is in-kind contribution from staff. Mr. Goble asked if there is a repository for uncovering money for people interested in restoring historic properties. Mr. Dellett said that this could work with Preservation PA.

Ms. Gustafson asked if the Field Guide to American Houses could be made available to HARB members as a resource tool in the paperback version. Mr. Dellett said that there are funds for publications in the Planning Department budget.

Reports

Mr. Shaffer announced the applications that received in-kind administrative approvals. Mr. Dellett said that he met with Borough Manager Charles Gable and Erin Hammerstedt from Preservation PA regarding the property at 58-60 Breckenridge Street on how they could get something in writing to approach Wells Fargo; but there was a private interested party in that property. Wells Fargo then decided to place the property on the auction block through Hudson and Marshall.

Other Business

There was no other business.

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

Respectfully submitted,

Karen M. Mesher
Borough Management Assistant