

MINUTES

**HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
August 1, 2022
THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. CITY GOVERNMENT CENTER
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Trina Gribble, Chair
Bruce Henry, Assistant Codes Administrator
Kali Tennis
April Rucker (left at 7:20 PM)

MEMBERS ABSENT: Camille Bennett

STAFF PRESENT: Geoffrey Knight, Planning Director
Stephen Ekema-Agbaw, Senior Deputy City Solicitor

OTHERS PRESENT: See Sign-In Sheet

CALL TO ORDER: 6:02 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mrs. Tennis moved, and Ms. Rucker seconded the motion, to Approve the minutes from the July 11, 2022 meeting without corrections. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (4-0).

OTHER BUSINESS:

Mrs. Gribble noted that the Board had discussed electing a Vice Chair at the previous month's meeting and opened the floor to nominations for the position. She nominated Mrs. Tennis, noting that she had already served as the Vice Chair in a provisional setting during the June 2022 HARB meeting; Ms. Rucker seconded the motion.

Mrs. Gribble asked what would happen if Mrs. Tennis voted against her nomination; Mr. Ekema-Agbaw noted that Mrs. Tennis could decline the nomination if she wanted. Mrs. Tennis asked if she would receive sufficient advance notice on whether she would need to function as the Board Chair. Mr. Knight noted that she would likely receive notice of the need to serve as the Chair for a meeting when Mrs. Gribble confirmed she would not be able to attend the meeting; Mrs. Tennis noted that the by-laws required 30 days of advance notice. Mr. Knight noted that he likely wouldn't be able to provide that much advance notice in most cases, such as if Mrs. Gribble became ill the day of the meeting. Mrs. Tennis noted that she wanted to be able to mentally prepare for serving as the Board Chair as far in advance of the meeting as possible.

Mr. Knight stated that he would circulate the annual meeting schedule and request confirmation from the Board members whether they intended to attend the regularly scheduled meeting or if they knew in advance that they had a scheduling conflict.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
July 11, 2022**

Mrs. Gribble moved, and Ms. Rucker seconded the motion, to appoint Mrs. Tennis as Vice Chair of the Board. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (4-0). Mrs. Gribble thanked Mrs. Tennis for agreeing to serve as the Vice Chair.

OLD BUSINESS: N/A

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. 215 & 217 North Front Street, filed by Stuart Scarborough with St. Stephen’s Episcopal Church, to install a fifteen-square-foot, painted-urethane, free-standing sign anchored into brick pillars in the front yard, as a replacement for a previous wooden free-standing sign in the same location.**

The case was represented by Stuart Scarborough on behalf of St. Stephen’s Episcopal Church (the property owner), 300 Chervil Court, Harrisburg, PA 17112 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant whether they wanted to provide additional information on the proposal or ask any questions regarding the Planning Bureau’s case report. The Applicant stated that they were looking forward to having a sign that better matched the architecture of the site than the previous free-standing sign.

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant to provide more information on the design of the proposed sign. The Applicant confirmed that the new sign was a foot shorter in height and would be slightly smaller in area. Mrs. Gribble asked whether the proposed sign had received the necessary zoning relief; Mr. Knight confirmed that because the signage height and the signage area was smaller than the previous sign, it was considered to be the continuance of legal, non-conforming aspects and thus did not require zoning relief.

Ms. Rucker stated that she appreciated that the brick pillars would match the brick in the buildings on-site.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there were any questions or comments from the other Board members. Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicant to confirm how the previous sign was damaged; the Applicant stated that it blew over in a windstorm and that it broke into several pieces at that time. Mrs. Tennis noted that the previous sign appeared to be carved wood, and asked what material the proposed signage would be comprised of. The Applicant confirmed that the previous sign had been painted high-density urethane and that the proposed signage would be the same design and material and would also have aluminum reinforcements within the signage material. Mrs. Tennis asked whether the proposed sign would have the same character and texture of the previous sign; the Applicant confirmed that the proposed sign would feature carved and painted urethane that would have a similar appearance to the previous sign.

Mrs. Tennis inquired about the anchoring of the sign, and asked whether the sign would have footers and how deep they might be installed. The Applicant confirmed that they had not finalized the design of the anchors, but that they would be installed in accordance with the code standards

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
July 11, 2022**

which required that they be installed at least 36 inches deep to get below the frost line. Mrs. Tennis asked how the previous wooden posts were installed, and the Applicant confirmed that they had not been anchored into the ground but had been mounted to metal cleats that had been stuck in the ground.

Mrs. Tennis referenced Ms. Rucker's statement that the bricks for the proposed columns would match the bricks in the buildings on-site, but noted that the buildings had two different colors of brick and that the renderings appeared to show bright red brick. The Applicant noted that the renderings were computer-generated and thus might not reflect the actual color of the brick used, and confirmed that they were not intending to match the existing bricks exactly. Ms. Rucker noted that the bricks in the building façades were old and had aged over time, and Mrs. Tennis asked if the project would utilize bricks that approximated the appearance of the existing brick on-site. The Applicant confirmed that specific brick types had not yet been determined, and that their mason would attempt to have the columns blend in to the surrounding architecture.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the proposed signage would be angled in the same way the previous sign had been configured; the Applicant confirmed that was the case.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the Board wanted to include a condition that the bricks in the support columns match the existing bricks on-site. The Applicant reiterated the differentiation in the brick color among the various structures on-site, with the brick in the cathedral façade being brown and the bricks in other buildings being red. He stated that the intention was to have the bricks in the support column be closer to the brown bricks in the cathedral façade.

Mrs. Tennis noted that the project design sounded as though it might be incomplete; the Applicant confirmed that the columns would be 20 inches by 20 inches, and that they would be anchoring them at least 36 inches below ground per building code. Mrs. Tennis asked whether he had considered using wood posts to anchor the sign; the Applicant stated that they felt brick columns would be sturdier and more congruent with the built environment.

Mr. Henry moved, and Ms. Rucker seconded the motion, to Approve. The motion was adopted by a majority vote (3-0-1; Mrs. Tennis abstained).

OTHER BUSINESS:

Discussion of HARB by-laws and regulations

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the Board members wanted to go through the existing by-laws word-for-word or just identify and discuss significant revisions to the by-laws. Mr. Ekema-Agbaw noted that the current by-laws were last updated in 2010, but that the City ordinance which allowed the Board to draft by-laws had been updated in 2014 [note: the refers to the Zoning Code], and noted that the Board could only draft by-laws that were consistent with the current City codes and State statutes. He noted that the current by-laws were not entirely consistent with the City codes, such as the reference to the City codes in the Board's by-laws.

Mrs. Tennis stated that she would support amending the by-laws to be consistent with the aspects that Mr. Ekema-Agbaw had referenced. Mrs. Gribble stated that she felt the Board should discuss potential changes at the current meeting, and then vote on revised by-laws at the September 2022

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
July 11, 2022**

HARB meeting. Mr. Knight confirmed that he would take notes on the proposed revisions that the Board discussed at the current meeting, edit the current by-laws, and then send the draft version to Board members ahead of the next meeting so that they could review the changes before voting to adopt them.

Mrs. Tennis stated that she wanted to ensure the by-laws were brought into conformance as soon as possible, and Mr. Ekema-Agbaw noted that any aspects which were not consistent with City codes were invalid anyways, so the Board wouldn't be bound by outdated regulations. He also noted that the Board could make any changes to the by-laws they wished, so long as they were consistent with the State and local enabling legislation. He confirmed that the by-laws were generally in good shape, and that the current by-laws could serve as an acceptable base to which changes could be made. Mr. Knight noted that any revisions proposed by the Board could be reviewed against the Zoning Code regulations to confirm their appropriateness.

Mrs. Gribble stated that she felt the Board should read through each section of the by-laws and discuss the information therein and whether any revisions needed to be made. She read through each of the Articles and the Board discussed necessary or recommended changes.

In Article 1, Mr. Ekema-Agbaw confirmed that the reference to the relevant chapter in the Zoning Code would need to be changed, as a new Zoning Code was adopted in 2014 after the most recent revision of the HARB by-laws, and the HARB regulations were in a different chapter. Mrs. Gribble stated that all the other information in the section appeared accurate, and asked whether there were any questions or comments from the other Board members; there were none.

In Article 2, Mrs. Gribble noted that some of the information in this section had been superseded by the regulations in the current Zoning Code, such as the members occupying all professional positions required on the Board not having to be residents of or owners of property in Harrisburg. Mr. Knight confirmed that and stated that that aspect should be updated within the by-laws to be consistent with the Zoning Code. He also noted that the by-laws did not specify whether Board members were required to reside in a municipal *or* national historic district; Mr. Ekema-Agbaw interjected, and noted that the definition of "historic district" within the Zoning Code did specify that it related to *municipal* historic districts and thus that distinction would be applicable to the by-laws as well. He also noted that this requirement only applied to the four, non-professional members of the Board.

Mr. Ekema-Agbaw asked how many municipal historic districts were in the city, and Mr. Knight confirmed that there were six such districts. Mrs. Gribble confirmed that the Board looked for members within municipal historic districts when attempting to fill vacancies. Ms. Rucker asked how long it had been since there had been a full seven members on the Board; Mr. Knight noted that Mr. Chamberlin had served on the Board until January 2022, but that he could not recall who other members were when the Board memberships were filled. Mrs. Tennis stated that in her review of past HARB determinations, she had seen decisions which were rendered by only three Board members. Ms. Rucker stated that she couldn't recall that being the case during her time on the Board, and Mr. Knight noted that it might have occurred at points in the past when the Planning Bureau was understaffed and it was more difficult to fill positions on boards. Mrs. Tennis noted that the situation may have existed before the by-laws were developed and Mr. Knight stated that

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
July 11, 2022**

there may have been temporary situations in the past when Board members resigned and they weren't able to get new members appointed in a timely manner, due to the requirement that candidates be reviewed and approved by City Council during a public hearing.

Mrs. Tennis confirmed that her nomination review took a long time and that the process was onerous from the applicant's perspective; Mr. Knight noted that the procedural issues likely could not be addressed in the by-laws because they were subject to City Council's regulations and standards. Mrs. Tennis noted that the Board should be upfront about the nomination process and timeline in their recruitment of potential members. She stated that she wasn't sure if that had been a challenge in recruiting board members in the past, and also noted there was no documentation to provide to prospective candidates regarding the nomination process and member responsibilities and commitments. She noted that the former Historic Preservation Specialist, Frank Grumbine, had provided her with documentation, but that it was not consistent with the information in the current by-laws. Mr. Knight requested that communication from Mrs. Tennis, to better understand the information that had previously been provided to candidates, and she noted that the information had been fairly limited and only included term limits and the required continuing education components. Mr. Knight confirmed that the continuing education was required for the City's participation in PHMC's Certified Local Government (CLG) program, and also noted that Board members were generally appointed for three-year terms.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there was a limit on how old a candidate needed to be to serve on the Board; Mr. Ekema-Agbaw stated that he wasn't sure whether there was a regulation prohibiting a minor from serving on the Board, but that as a practical matter, it was probably against the City's Codes. Ms. Rucker noted that any prospective member would have to have knowledge specific to their duties on the Board. Mr. Knight noted that the requirements and responsibilities of the Board wouldn't necessarily preclude a high school student from serving on the Board, but agreed with Mr. Ekema-Agbaw that other City codes likely prohibited a minor from serving on a Board as a representative of the City. Mrs. Gribble stated that Article 2 should be revised to comply with the applicable City codes.

Mr. Knight noted a potential conflict within the language of Article 2, specifically that different sentences stated that board members must be residents of historic districts, but also that they could merely own property. He noted that the Board may want to remove the clause regarding property ownership, or that they may want to keep it to ensure that Board members not subject to the residency requirement still maintained a financial interest in the effective management of the municipal historic districts. Mrs. Gribble stated that she felt it was appropriate to leave the language in the by-laws, but noted that she wasn't sure if it complied with other sections of the City's codes. Mrs. Tennis stated that she felt there was a significant distinction between living in a municipal historic district and only owning property as a landlord.

Mrs. Tennis asked for clarification on who the Codes Bureau's designee could be; she asked who might be eligible to be a designee in the event Codes Bureau staff did not want to perform that role. Mr. Henry noted that serving on the Board was included in his job description, so that it would always be the Deputy Codes Administrator. Mr. Knight noted that there might be a situation in which Mr. Henry could not attend a meeting, but a Codes Enforcement Officer was required to establish a quorum, and in that case, Mr. Henry could instruct that individual to attend the meeting.

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
July 11, 2022**

and then provide guidance on how he intended to vote on various projects. Mrs. Gribble suggested that language be added to clarify that the designee would have to be someone from the Codes Bureau; Mr. Henry noted that it would always be either the Codes Administrator or Deputy Codes Administrator, because only management-level employees could be asked to attend after-hours meetings.

Mrs. Tennis noted that they might want to include references to proxy votes, so that Mr. Henry could designate someone else to attend the meeting and then vote on his behalf. Ms. Rucker noted that proxy votes were taken by the Board Chair; she clarified that if she was not able to attend a meeting but still wanted to vote on a case, she could allow the Board Chair to count her vote for whichever way the Chair decided to vote. Mr. Knight noted that he felt the current language was sufficient to enable meetings and votes to proceed appropriately. He noted that one of the purposes of including a Codes Bureau employee was that their experience and expertise would be useful in better understanding the code requirements for physical construction; as an example, he noted that Mr. Henry would be able to confirm Mrs. Tennis' previous questions regarding the anchoring of the free-standing sign.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether they had determined whether the residency requirement only applied to the four non-professional Board appointments. Mr. Knight confirmed that only the registered architect, realtor, and Codes Bureau appointee were not required to live in the city.

In Article 3, Mrs. Gribble noted that the Board hadn't always followed the provisions in this section, specifically with respect to advising the public, other City departments, the Mayor, and City Council, or in providing an annual report to the Mayor and City Council. Mr. Knight noted that the Board was in conformance with some aspects, since the Planning Bureau functioned as staff to the Board and provided the services outlined in this section. He noted that the alternative would be that the Planning Bureau would forward all inquiries and permits to volunteer board members and then review and respond to them, and that this type of coordination or review was infeasible.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there was an annual report that was provided to the Mayor and City Council. Mr. Knight noted that this likely referred to the annual report that was required for participation in the CLG program and was due in February of each year, and stated that through this documentation, the Planning Bureau provided annual updates to the Administration. He noted that a report was not specifically provided to City Council, but confirmed the Bureau coordinated with the Mayor's Office in completing that annual report and kept them apprised of the higher-level historic preservation issues. Mrs. Tennis noted that the Board seemed to be following these aspects of the by-laws through Planning Bureau staff, who functioned as the non-voting secretary of the Board.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the Planning Bureau functioning as an extension of the Board should be clarified in the by-laws. Mrs. Tennis noted that the relationship was discussed later in the by-laws in Article 8. Mr. Knight noted that the Board could add a sentence to the end of this section clarifying the intention that Planning Bureau staff would serve as an extension of the Board for the purposes of meeting this provision of the by-laws. Mrs. Tennis asked whether the timing was aligned with the governmental fiscal year; Mr. Knight clarified that the federal fiscal year began

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
July 11, 2022**

around July 1st but that he did not believe that the annual report specified in the by-laws was used by City Council in consideration of the City's annual budget.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether putting more of an emphasis on the annual report would be useful in recruiting Board members; she referenced the discussion from the previous month's meeting regarding the lack of representation from the Allison Hill municipal historic district. Ms. Rucker requested clarification on the boundaries of that district; Mr. Knight noted that it comprised a small area just south of the YWCA facility at the corner of Market & Cameron Streets.

Ms. Rucker noted that the Board did not receive COA applications from that neighborhood, and Mr. Knight noted that while the Board did not receive applications from this district, the Planning Bureau did review building permits for work in the area. He noted that there had been a significant amount of disinvestment and various absentee landlords in the neighborhood, and that it seemed many of them did small projects at night and on weekends to avoid City review of their projects. He stated that the Planning Bureau did apply the same level of regulatory scrutiny to properties in that district as in other municipal historic districts, but that due to lax enforcement over the past few decades, there had been non-historic alterations made to many of the buildings, such as fiberglass doors or vinyl windows, which thus created existing non-historic aspects that could be replaced in-kind, per the Historic District Design Guidelines. Mr. Knight noted that this led to a lack of historic integrity in the building inventory that differentiated it from other historic districts.

Ms. Rucker stated that the City needed to improve enforcement of this historic district regulations in that neighborhood; Mr. Knight concurred and stated that he hoped more owner-occupants moved into the area and took a more proactive role in enhancing the historic and architectural character of the neighborhood. He stated that there were owner-occupants in the neighborhood who might be good candidates for the Board vacancies. Mr. Knight also posited whether a resident of an Architectural Conservation Overlay District (ACOD) could serve on the Board, as they would not reside in a municipal historic district; he noted that there were active residents in the Summit Terrace neighborhood. Mr. Ekema-Agbaw stated that the State legislation would likely allow residents of ACODs to serve on the Board, but that City regulations would not. Mrs. Gribble concurred and stated that getting Board candidates from different districts within the city should be a goal.

Mrs. Gribble noted that if the Board wanted to retain the annual report to the Mayor's Office and City Council in their by-laws, they should discuss whether to include review of an internal report during their February meetings. Mr. Knight stated that it might be preferable to have an annual report delivered to City Council in December, since the Board did not meet during that month and thus it would be easier to summarize the activities of the Board and the overall review of historic preservation issues in a report delivered during that month. He stated that he would have to coordinate with City Council, as they often only met once or twice in December, and their agendas were usually preoccupied with reviewing and approving a budget for the following year. He noted that a presentation in January may be more acceptable to City Council. Mrs. Tennis noted that the annual meeting was also intended to be held in January.

Mrs. Tennis noted that Article 4 of the by-laws did not state that the Board was given off the month of December. Mr. Knight noted that when he started at the City, HARB usually had not met during

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
July 11, 2022**

the month of January, but that it had been switched to December to allow Board members more time off during the holidays. He stated that he had made a policy decision a few years ago to change the month for the benefit of Board members; he also noted that the Board may want to include that in Article 4 of the by-laws so that future Planning Bureau staff and board members were aware of it. Mrs. Tennis agreed.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the Board would be hearing applicants and cases during the same day that they held their scheduled annual meeting in January. Mr. Knight confirmed that was the case, but noted that the Board had previously held annual retreats on a different date than their regularly-scheduled meeting, and usually held them in an off-site location such as the Harrisburg Transportation Center or Historic Harrisburg Association. He noted that the Board would often have speakers from organizations such as PHMC or HHA. Mr. Knight noted that Board might want to have the annual report reviewed and discussed during that meeting, and then vote to have it presented to City Council. Mrs. Tennis stated that it might be a good idea to provide an analysis of which historic districts had seen projects and what type of administrative reviews had been completed by the Planning Bureau; Mr. Knight noted that it might be helpful to outline the locations of projects on a map.

In Article 4, Mr. Knight stated that he would include a reference to the Board receiving one month off during the year.

In Article 5, Mrs. Gribble noted that the current Board was comprised of five members and thus a quorum would require at least three members. Mrs. Tennis noted some confusion about how many board members need to be at a meeting and how many needed to vote for a formal action, and suggested that specific numbers of Board members be included in the by-laws. She noted that the Board had previously cancelled meetings because they assumed that four members needed to be in attendance to establish a quorum. Mr. Knight stated that he could clarify the language or outline an example to provide better guidance to future board members.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there was ever a time when there were seven members. Mr. Knight confirmed that there were, and noted that while there were only five members when he initially started with the City that, more recently, there were seven members several years ago.

In Article 6, Mrs. Gribble noted that the Board had recently addressed the issue of conflicts of interest, and that the rules were a bit more nuanced than outlined in the by-laws and included the consideration of tiebreaker votes; she asked whether the by-laws should include references to State ethics regulations. Mr. Ekema-Agbaw stated that he felt it might be a bit complicated to outline all possible scenarios based on how infrequently conflicts of issue would likely arise. Mr. Knight asked whether it would be possible to just reference the relevant sections of the State Ethics Code; Mr. Ekema-Agbaw read through the State Ethics Code, and noted that it was designed to protect individuals from the State Ethics Act itself and was not necessarily intended as general guidelines for Board governance.

Mr. Knight noted that because the Board's resolution was only recommendatory to City Council, it might not matter if there is a tie vote by the Board, since City Council could ultimately break the tie and make a final decision on approval or denial of a project. Mr. Ekema-Agbaw agreed, and

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
July 11, 2022**

noted that many of the State Ethics Code regulations were designed for bodies with more decision-making and thus because the Board was advisory, the consequences of any decisions made were less dire. He stated that he did not want to dissuade the Board from adopting rules on ethics and conflicts of interest, but wanted to clarify that there was less chance of any potential issue causing significant problems. He stated that he felt the existing by-law language was appropriate.

Mrs. Tennis stated that she felt the last sentence from Article 4 should be included in Article 6. She noted that Board members should disclose any potential conflicts of interest before joining the Board, and wondered whether that should be included in the by-laws. Mrs. Tennis noted that Harrisburg was a small city, and thus that it was possible, and perhaps even likely, that Board members would have relationships with applicants that came before the Board. She asked what the threshold for conflicts would be, and noted that it could be somewhat subjective.

Mr. Knight agreed and noted that Board members, and especially the architect and realtor, would likely have professional relationships with firms doing work in historic districts, and asked whether that would preclude those Board members from voting on cases involving those entities. He asked whether a Board member would have to be employed by a company or organization, or whether they would have to have a familial relationship with any such entity, to establish a conflict of interest that would preclude them from hearing the case.

Mrs. Gribble noted that she was a parishioner of St. Stephen's Episcopal Church (the Applicant for the case heard at the night's meeting) and asked whether that would preclude her from voting on the case; she stated that if that were the threshold, that it would make it difficult for many Board members to hear cases. Mrs. Tennis agreed and asked whether the more pertinent issue was a requirement to disclose any relationships, not necessarily to preclude members from voting on them. Mr. Ekema-Agbaw noted that conflicts of interest could be very context-specific and thus it might be difficult to create language in the by-laws that effectively covered the issue; he stated that the Board may want to define for themselves what constituted a "conflict of interest" and how to regulate them.

Mr. Knight reiterated that Harrisburg was a relatively small city and noted that Board members were civically-engaged citizens, and thus it was likely they would know many people, businesses, and organizations, so they might want to consider a narrower definition of conflict of interest.

Mrs. Gribble referenced the prohibition against discussing projects with applicants outlined in Article 4. She stated that applicants sometimes approached her for guidance on how to design a project and that she always referred them to the Planning Bureau staff, but that she felt that giving advice on historically-appropriate work was actually in the interest of the Board. Mrs. Tennis agreed that it was good policy to refer interested parties to the City. Mr. Ekema-Agbaw stated that discussing projects outside of public meetings would be a violation of the State's Sunshine Act.

Mr. Knight noted that the "upcoming agenda items" really only referred to the upcoming month because the Planning Bureau did not create agendas more than one month out, and thus that the prohibition wouldn't actually apply to any longer-term projects. He stated that if a potential applicant ran into a board member in their personal life, they could provide them with information consistent with the standards and regulations in the Historic District Design Guidelines and,

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
July 11, 2022**

indeed, that was something that all members should be doing. He stated that board members could refer those individuals to the Guidelines themselves, but that it wouldn't be a violation of the by-laws to give them verbal confirmation of information in the document.

In Article 7, Mrs. Gribble noted board members had received invitations to training classes from Planning Bureau staff, but that it could be difficult to attend them if they were held during the day. She stated that as an architect, she often attended qualifying training session as part of her job, but noted that other board members may not have that option.

Ms. Rucker noted that she had been the only board member to attend a previous education course that had been shared with the Board in 2021.

Mrs. Tennis inquired as to whether the American Institute of Architects (AIA) lecture that she and Mrs. Gribble had attended qualified for credit; Mrs. Gribble stated that it did. She stated that continuing education was an important part of their membership on the Board, and noted that it was required as a condition of the City's participation in PHMC's Certified Local Government (CLG) grant. She asked whether there was a way to help the board members more easily obtain the required training hours; Mr. Knight noted that he could explore scheduling presentations during monthly meetings from product manufacturers and individuals in the historic preservation industry such as PHMC staff. He noted that there were usually several months during the year which featured shorter agendas and would be good times to schedule presentations at the end of meetings. He noted that it might be challenging to find someone willing to present to the Board on a few weeks' notice.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the board members wanted to retain the training requirement outlined in Article 7; Ms. Rucker agreed and noted that there were times when it was more difficult to find a training class that would qualify for CLG credit. Mrs. Tennis stated that she wasn't sure how to find training classes; Mr. Knight noted that he was also unsure as to where to get regular updates and noted that the previous Historic Preservation Specialist was more knowledgeable about those opportunities. Mr. Knight stated that he believed the Planning Bureau budget could reimburse board members for costs associated with attending continuing education classes. Mrs. Gribble stated that she would also notify the Board and Planning Bureau staff if she became aware of eligible trainings through her professional work.

In Article 8, Mrs. Gribble asked whether the Board had convened any special committees on which she would sit as the Chair; Mr. Knight stated that he was not aware of any such committees having been convened during his time with the City. Mrs. Gribble noted that the Board had held special meetings when developing and reviewing the Historic District Design Guidelines passed in 2021. Mr. Knight noted that the Academy Manor neighborhood was interested in pursuing National Historic District designation and noted that the Board may wish to convene special meetings to assist the neighborhood in accomplishing that goal.

In Article 9, Mr. Knight noted that it might be difficult to enforce the requirement for a 30-day notice if an individual was seeking to resign from the Board. Mrs. Gribble stated that the Board should determine how to enable the effective turnover and replacement of positions that this section of the by-laws intended to achieve. Mrs. Tennis asked whether Mr. Henry was completing

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
July 11, 2022**

the term of Ms. Montgomery, a previous Board member; Mr. Knight stated that he did not believe the Codes Bureau designee was serving under a specified term limit, noting that there had never been an appointment for the Codes Bureau board member. He noted that there would always be a Codes Administrator or Deputy Codes Administrator who would serve on the Board as part of their job responsibilities. Mrs. Tennis asked how long Ms. Montgomery had served; Mr. Knight responded that it had been at least five years, noting that Mr. Art Emerick (the former Deputy Codes Administrator) had retired in 2016.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the by-laws should specify that the Codes Bureau designee did not require appointment by City Council and did not serve under a term limit. Mr. Knight stated that he didn't think it was necessary to include that in the by-laws.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether her appointment to the Board was filling the remainder of a vacancy; Mr. Knight confirmed that she was not completing an existing term and had begun a new term upon her appointment. Mr. Knight confirmed that she was the only board member on an unexpired term and that her three-year term ended on October 27, 2023. Mr. Knight noted that any board member could serve on an expired term until they were reappointed or replaced.

Mrs. Tennis noted that it generally took City Council longer than 30 days to appoint a new board member, and thus that it might be difficult to have a replacement board member nominated, reviewed, and appointed before an existing board member gave their notice to resign and then stepped down. Mr. Knight stated that the intention of the language in the by-laws was not to ensure that there were no vacancies, but rather to minimize the amount of time that seats stayed vacant.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there was a minimum number of members that were required to constitute an active Board; Mr. Ekema-Agbaw confirmed that the State enabling legislation required at least five board members. Mrs. Tennis stated that the minimum number of board members should be included in the by-laws, noting that if a current candidate stepped down, the Board would no longer be able to meet and, when it did commence meetings after getting additional candidates, it would have a large backlog of applications submitted in the meantime. Mrs. Tennis stated that it should create an imperative for City Council to make the appointment process faster and easier.

Mr. Knight noted that an alternative approach would be to establish alternate members, as other boards had, who would receive documentation, but would not hear or vote on cases unless regular members were going to miss a meeting. He noted that the individual would then automatically step in to fill any vacancies, although he did note that if there were not enough individuals to have a full board, there likely wouldn't be candidates available for alternate positions either; he stated that the Board wasn't currently faced with the problem of too many people wanting to serve. He did note that the Board may want to include language authorizing an alternate in the event there was enough interest in the future in Board positions. Mr. Knight stated that he could provide the individual with case documentation and resolutions so that they were aware of the status of cases and the decisions made by the Board that established precedents or guidance for future reviews.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether training funds could be used for community education events that could double as recruitment efforts. She noted that it would help inform the public about historic district

**MINUTES – HARB Regular Meeting
July 11, 2022**

issues, allow the board members to meet their annual education requirements, and serve as a recruitment tool. Mrs. Gribble stated that there was a lot of interest in the public meetings they held to review the Historic District Design Guidelines and noted that Historic Harrisburg Association (HHA) was helpful in promoting the efforts and soliciting input.

Mrs. Tennis noted that HHA sometimes held educational seminars, such as having a developer or contractor present at a project they were doing, and suggested that flyers could be handed out at those events. Mr. Knight noted that Mr. Grumbine used to work closely with HHA and would often attend their monthly meetings to present on a particular topic or discuss the HARB review process with the public. He noted that such efforts would likely not be possible given the current capacity of the Planning Bureau, but that it was something to consider when the Historic Preservation Specialist position was filled.

In Article 10, Mr. Knight stated that this section of the by-laws was likely developed when the Planning Bureau was nested under the Codes Bureau, noting that his bureau had been moved around under different departments during his time with the City. He noted that the Planning Bureau kept records of all HARB approvals, administrative approvals and denials of permits, and violations, and he noted that he was actively working on conducting site visits to follow-up on approved work and violations, photograph work, and maintain these records within the Bureau's files. He stated that he felt the Bureau did a good job of archiving projects. Mrs. Gribble stated that she felt that information would be good to see in the annual report.

In Article 11, Mrs. Gribble noted that the annual meeting schedule was made available to the public on the City's website, and Mrs. Tennis noted that notice of applications and meetings was posted on subject properties. Mr. Knight confirmed that the annual meeting schedule with the meeting dates and submittal deadlines was located around the Planning Bureau office and was advertised in PennLive at the end of every calendar year. He also noted that he included the meeting schedule as an attachment on an email to any pending applicant or interested party.

In Article 12, Mr. Knight noted that they were addressing by-law updates at the current meeting. Mrs. Gribble noted that the next step would be formal revisions to the by-laws. Mr. Knight stated that he would incorporate aspects from the discussion at the current meeting into a revised draft version of the by-laws (with tracked changes and comments), and then circulate that to the board members for their review ahead of discussion and a vote at the September 12th HARB meeting. He stated that he would include in on the agenda for that meeting. Mr. Ekema-Agbaw stated that he would review the revisions ahead of that meeting.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:35 PM

Mrs. Gribble moved, and Mrs. Tennis seconded the motion, to adjourn. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (3-0); the meeting adjourned at 7:35 PM.