

MINUTES

**HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
September 11, 2023
THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. CITY GOVERNMENT CENTER
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Trina Gribble, Chair
Kali Tennis, Vice Chair
Bruce Henry, Deputy Codes Administrator
Camille Bennett
Kent Hurst

MEMBERS ABSENT: April Rucker

STAFF PRESENT: Geoffrey Knight, Planning Director
Emily Farren, Assistant City Solicitor

OTHERS PRESENT: See Sign-In Sheet

CALL TO ORDER: 6:00 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Mr. Henry moved, and Ms. Bennett seconded the motion, to approve the minutes from the June 5, 2023 meeting without corrections. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

OLD BUSINESS: N/A

NEW BUSINESS:

- 1. 29 North Front Street, filed by Karen Cullings with the Dauphin County Library System, to install a new wall sign above the new Walnut Street entrance and to install a free-standing sign in the northeastern corner of the lot.**

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved with the following conditions:

1. The backer for the proposed wall signage will only be anchored through the wooden door surround and not through the granite header above.

The case was represented by Karen Cullings with the Dauphin County Library System (the property owner), 101 Walnut Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant whether they wanted to provide additional information regarding the proposal. The Applicant stated that they were trying to match the existing signage on-site and increase the visibility of and traffic flow to the building, and that they were happy to answer any questions the Board may have.

HARB Meeting Minutes September 11, 2023

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there were any questions or comments from the other Board members.

Mr. Hurst asked whether the free-standing sign would be identical to the existing free-standing sign on-site; the Applicant confirmed that it would, although it would be comprised of a different material. Mr. Hurst stated that he was a bit concerned about the sign requiring the removal of existing plantings on-site; the Applicant stated that they had reviewed the site and could install the sign without the loss of mature landscaping.

Mr. Hurst asked whether the proposed wall sign above the new main entrance would match the existing wall signage around the former entrance; the Applicant confirmed it would use the same pin letters in the same font and style of the existing wall signage and would identify the building as the “T. Morris Chester Welcome Center.”

Ms. Bennett moved, and Mr. Henry seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

Mrs. Gribble noted that she had forgotten to solicit input from the public and recognized two individuals from the public who wished to speak on behalf of the project. Lenwood Sloan, with the Commonwealth Monument Project, thanked the Board and noted that the project would create the first African-American-identified cultural site in downtown Harrisburg; he noted that it completed a five-year effort to rename the library, a section of Walnut Street, and the south lawn of the Capitol Complex after Mr. Chester.

Mark Smith, who serves on the Board of the Dauphin County Library System, stated that he felt the Applicant did a good job of presenting information relevant to the project. He stated that he had just arrived from a performance at the library and that he was energized to hear about the history of the property and the city. He thanked the Board for their decision.

Mr. Sloan noted that outside of the City’s MLK City Government Center, there was no other public or non-profit organization in Harrisburg named after an African-American.

2. 1400 North 3rd Street, filed by Josh Kesler with Silverstone Enterprises, LLC, to replace the existing glass block windows on the side elevation along Calder Street with bifold doors, to replace the secondary entrance and glass block on the front elevation along North 3rd Street with an aluminum, divided lite window, and to replace all existing window openings with aluminum, divided lite windows.

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved with the following conditions:

1. The Applicant will utilize both interior (between the glass panes) and exterior divided lite grills in the proposed windows.

The case was represented by Molly Cooley on behalf of Silverstone Enterprises (the property owner), 1321 North 4th Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102 (aka “the Applicant”).

HARB Meeting Minutes

September 11, 2023

Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant whether they wanted to provide additional information regarding the proposal. The Applicant stated that she did not, but that she would try to answer any questions the Board members may have.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there were any questions or comments from the other Board members.

Mr. Hurst asked whether the project proposed the replacement of all the existing glass block windows on-site; the Applicant confirmed that was the case and that they would be installing wooden bi-fold doors to the side of the main entrance. Mr. Knight clarified that the bi-fold doors would only be installed to the left of the entrance and not on both sides. Mr. Hurst asked whether the glass block windows on either side of the main entrance would be opened up to provide more interior light; Mr. Knight confirmed that was the case.

Mrs. Tennis asked for clarification on the installation of doors. Mr. Knight noted that the doors would only replace the glass block wall to the left of the main entrance, and noted that the project was similar to one previously proposed by, and approved for, Mangia Qui several years ago; he noted that the intent was to accommodate al fresco dining. Mrs. Tennis asked whether the project intended for the bi-fold doors to provide another means of ingress/egress and whether that would require additional elements like steps or railings; the Applicant stated that she was not aware of the doors being installed specifically to provide access. Mr. Knight noted that he had spoken with the property owner the previous week and that the project did not involve additional elements or modification of the concrete water table.

Mrs. Tennis expressed concern that the application documentation did not include detailed drawings of the proposed exterior work, and that she wasn't exactly sure what project elements would require HARB review; she noted that there were cellar doors in the sidewalk along the side of the building and asked whether they would be removed as part of the project. The Applicant stated that she was not aware of the proposed work involving removal of those elements. Mr. Hurst noted that the doors were likely being installed for the purposes of ventilation. The Applicant reiterated that she did not believe the bi-fold doors were intended to provide for movement of staff or patrons. Mr. Knight noted that there would likely be sidewalk seating that would preclude movement through the doors, and that it was mainly to provide air flow.

Mr. Hurst stated that he had nothing against the proposed doors, but questioned how they might operate in practice if there were intended to be tables nearby. The Applicant stated that the property owner had not discussed proposed seating with her. Mr. Knight stated that the operational aspects of the doors would be up to either the property owner or the owner/manager of any business on-site, and noted that they could simply open the doors at the beginning of the day and close them at the end of the day.

Mrs. Gribble requested clarification on where the specific doors would be installed; Mrs. Tennis noted they would only be replacing the glass block window to the left of the entrance. Mr. Knight stated that to the right of the main entrance, the Applicant proposed to replace the glass block window and the non-original entry door with a divided lite window and infill brick.

HARB Meeting Minutes

September 11, 2023

Mrs. Gribble outlined the main elements of the project including the replacement of the glass block windows with simulated divided lite windows, and that the case report included a condition regarding the simulated divided lite grilles. Mr. Knight clarified that the condition was meant to ensure that grilles on the outside of the panes (exterior) and between the window panes (interior) were used. Mrs. Gribble confirmed that Marvin windows generally included both types of grilles, and recommended that the condition be included in the final resolution; Mr. Hurst concurred.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the subject property was connected to the adjacent property (note: this is 1402 North 3rd Street); the Applicant confirmed that they were separate buildings and separate owners.

Ms. Bennett asked whether the Applicants intended to retain the existing transoms, specifically above the front entrance; the Applicant stated that she was unfamiliar with the term. Mr. Knight clarified that the transom was currently infilled with a wooden panel and that in his discussions with the property owner, there was no mention of addressing this specific aspect of the building. He confirmed that the project would be replacing the solid metal door with a wooden door featuring a half-view, divided lite pane.

Ms. Bennett asked whether the canopy above the main entrance would be altered; Mr. Knight confirmed that there was no aspect of the project that indicated the awning would be changed in any way. Mr. Hurst stated that the canopy and sign appeared to be original to the building and were, at least, historically relevant. Mr. Knight noted that he had requested old photographs of the building which would help in determining whether the project required HARB review and, if so, how to approach it, and noted that the Applicant did not have such documentation and had even engaged Historic Harrisburg Association on finding older records, to no avail. He stated that while he wasn't sure if the canopy or projecting sign were original to the building, they had achieved "historicness" in their own right as contributing aspects of the property. Ms. Bennett requested confirmation that the awning and sign would remain; Mr. Knight confirmed that was the case.

Mrs. Gribble clarified that the windows would black aluminum-clad wooden windows with simulated divided lite grilles. Mr. Knight confirmed that the Applicant proposed to use Marvin Ultimate windows, which the Board previously reviewed and approved for the upper-floor windows at 1714 Green Street. Mrs. Tennis noted that during a presentation by Frank Grumbine (former City Historic Preservation Specialist, now with PHMC) at a previous meeting, they discussed the how property and each case were unique; she stated that as a highly-visible corner property on the block, it was a visual anchor for the streetscape and that she felt the context mattered with respect to the material and design. Mr. Knight concurred and noted that if the conditions on-site were different, he would have given more consideration to the recommendation and imposition of conditions. He noted, however, that the building's fenestration had been significantly altered over time and that the only remaining windows appeared to be glass block or vinyl; he noted the Applicant could theoretically replace the windows with the same inappropriate materials and design and thus he felt the proposed windows were an improvement over the existing conditions.

Mr. Henry asked whether the windows were appropriate for the building within the context of the surrounding and neighborhood. Mr. Knight noted that there was a significant variety in windows

HARB Meeting Minutes

September 11, 2023

along the block to the north; he referenced floor-to-ceiling plate glass windows in the Susquehanna Art Museum, that the Board had required the owner of the adjacent property to retain one-over-one wooden windows, and that the new building at the northern end of the block featured more modern windows in a range of configurations. He stated that given this variety, there was no singular aesthetic to the block that would compel the Board to require one or two specific types of windows. Mr. Hurst noted that the primary concern was to mitigate or remove the prevailing aesthetic of infilled and inappropriately-replaced windows on the subject property.

Mrs. Tennis inquired as to the proposal for the brick-infilled window openings; the Applicant confirmed that they would be replaced with the simulated divided lite window, which is similar to what existed in the past.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there were any other drawings or plans that showed what the final appearance would be. Mr. Hurst stated that during his brief tenure on the Board, he noted that most applicants did not provide an illustration of what a building would look like after any proposed work; he noted that this put the responsibility on the Board members to try to mentally combine distinct elements of a project and envision what an approval might produce as a final result and whether it conformed to the regulations and guidelines that informed their decisions. Mr. Knight noted that the primary issue was cost; particularly in smaller residential projects, requiring applicants to provide an architectural rendering may make a project prohibitively expensive. He noted that applicants also referenced the cost of a particular material or design in requesting approval of an alternative product. Mrs. Gribble concurred with Mr. Hurst's statement and noted that there could be difficulty in asking Board members to envision all proposed changes without a drawing or plan providing context.

Mrs. Gribble stated that she felt the overall project was a step in the right direction towards mitigating non-historic alterations on the subject building. She stated that the aluminum cladding on the windows was less of a concern, since aluminum windows were available during the building's time of construction (1940), and noted that the proposed windows appeared appropriate for the commercial/institutional nature of the property. Mrs. Gribble concurred with Mr. Hurst and Mrs. Tennis that it would be helpful if more applicants could provide detailed or illustrated drawings of the proposed conditions.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether the entrance on 3rd Street would remain; the Applicant noted that the door was not original to the structure and would be removed and replaced with a large window and brick infill.

Mr. Henry moved to approve the project. Mrs. Tennis asked whether the HVAC units on the building would be removed; the Applicant confirmed that was the case.

Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicant whether the conditions were clear; Mr. Knight recited the conditions from the case report.

Mrs. Tennis inquired about the specifics of the simulated divided lite windows; the Applicant stated that she believed they were only installed on the exterior of the panes. Mr. Knight noted that the Planning Bureau's condition was intended to ensure that both external and internal grilles

HARB Meeting Minutes

September 11, 2023

would be required; he noted that it was a bit unclear from the submitted documentation whether the project proposed to use both types of simulated divided lite grilles. Mrs. Gribble noted that the products specifications submitted with the application indicated that the windows would use both kinds.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether there were any questions or comments from the other Board members; there were none.

Mr. Henry moved, and Mr. Hurst seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a majority vote (3-2).

Mr. Hurst asked two of the Board members why they chose to vote against the project. Mrs. Tennis stated that she was concerned about whether the bi-fold doors would encourage ingress or egress which might require that additional steps be installed, and also that she was concerned about the lack of drawings showing the proposed conditions. Mr. Henry noted that the Applicant had not indicated that the bi-fold doors would be used for egress. Mrs. Tennis stated that she wasn't sure why they were proposing doors if they were not going to be used for egress. Mr. Knight noted that many restaurants used those types of doors to create an al fresco dining experience. Mrs. Tennis stated that the proposal did not seem sensible.

Mr. Hurst asked Ms. Bennett what concerns she had about the project; she stated that she didn't feel a need to explain her vote.

3. 410 North 3rd Street, filed by Trina Gribble with McKissick Associates, to replace the existing masonry façade on the front elevation with a combination of thin brick and cementitious/metal panel assembly, and to replace windows on the side elevation with aluminum casement or awning windows.

Mrs. Gribble noted that she was the listed Applicant for the project and that her firm was the project architect and stated that she was recusing herself from the discussion and vote. As the Vice Chair, Mrs. Tennis took on the responsibilities as Acting Chair for this case.

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

The case was represented by Vern McKissick with McKissick Associates Architects (the project architect), 317 North Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101; and Phyllis Heverly Flesher with PSEA (the property owner), 400 North 3rd Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101 (aka "the Applicants").

Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicants whether they wanted to provide additional information regarding the proposal. They distributed updated project plan sets to the Board members and City staff, which included existing conditions photos of the subject property and other nearby buildings, and two variations of the proposed façade treatment.

The Applicants stated that they wanted to discuss the proposal, why they felt it was necessary, and how they came to the conclusion that the subject property was a non-contributing structure and thus the proposed alterations were appropriate. They discussed the variety of architectural styles

HARB Meeting Minutes

September 11, 2023

and elements of buildings along the corridor. The Applicants stated that their solution involve a mixed of new “thin brick” and installation of panel “skins.”

The Applicant noted that the subject property was constructed approximately four years before the municipal historic district was formed; they noted that they had researched all the buildings listed in the documentation submitted to the National Register and that the subject building was not listed as being contributory. They read through the National Register of Historic Places inventory nomination form, which described the character of the district and noted that it stated that most “intrusions” in the district (at that time) were modern office buildings; they stated this supported their contention that the building was not contributory. The Applicants noted that the establishment of the historic district was largely predicated on the “architectural and/or historic merit” of the buildings downtown. They stated that the majority of the city’s historic buildings were constructed between the 1870s and the 1930s.

The Applicants noted that the building was only 51 years old and stated that buildings do not immediately become contributory structures once they pass the fifty-year threshold. They noted that a structure needed to be evaluated within the context of the historic district in which it was located. They stated that the proposed façade was intended to help the building façade remain “in the background” with respect to the streetscape generally and the adjacent structures on the block specifically.

The Applicants stated that the building was poorly “detailed” when it was constructed in 1972 and utilized a monolithic wall instead of a cavity wall, with brick masonry attached directly to the CMU block wall behind it without a drainage plane or moisture barriers. They noted that the site photos they provided showed that the wall, which was not sealed, had deteriorated due to these issues. The Applicants noted that pieces of brick and mortar had begun falling onto the sidewalk below.

The Applicants noted that the projecting windows prominent in the building was a feature of Brutalist architecture that was not very common because many of them had failed in other buildings. They noted that the curved bricks on the bottom and sides of the windows were not a major concern, but that the curved brick on the top of the windows is where the primary issue was occurring, as the exposed mortar joints allowed water intrusion.

The Applicants stated that they had considered whether they could replicate the curved brick around the windows without creating the same water intrusion issues, but noted that it would be challenging. They also stated that their proposed design maintained the same façade depth while incorporating a cavity and drainage plane through the use of the “thin brick” material.

The Applicants stated that, in considering how the project would approach the required façade work, they asked themselves whether the structure was just an old building or a *good* old building, and whether it contributed to the historic architecture and streetscape along 3rd Street. They noted that the blocks to the south of Pine Street were not in the historic district and that the boundary south of that was made irregular to “eliminate non-historic structures.” They stated that the current structure represented infill which did not reference the other architecture along the 3rd Street

HARB Meeting Minutes

September 11, 2023

corridor, and thus they felt that a change in façade appearance would not be detrimental to the character of the district.

The Applicants stated that they proposed the new materials to best retain the existing appearance of the building while not recreating the same issues that caused the current problems. They stated that the goals were to create a safe situation for building occupants and to ensure the façade was harmonious with the buildings on either side, which were also owned by the Applicant, while not necessarily “tying them together.” The Applicants noted that they were retaining the existing recessed entry and first-floor window alcoves. They stated that they weren’t trying to take away from the character of the historic district, but rather to create something that looks like it fits better into the streetscape while addressing the structural concerns.

The Applicants noted that their proposed design was not selected to save money on the overall project, and that in-kind replacement of the existing façade was slightly cheaper than the proposed design. They reiterated that they felt the proposal was more aesthetically pleasing than the existing conditions and would provide a longer lifespan into the future.

Mrs. Tennis inquired as to the form that the Applicants were referencing in their discussion of the history of the property; the Applicants noted that it was the Department of the Interior National Park Service data form for the National Register of Historic Places, and that it had been completed in January 1976. She noted that the building was in a Municipal Historic District and thus was subject to HARB review. The Applicants concurred that the project was subject to HARB review, but reiterated that they felt it was a non-contributory structure; they noted that whatever design was chosen did require HARB review and approval. They noted that their concern was whether their proposal adversely impacted the contributing buildings; Mrs. Tennis noted that it was up to the Board to determine whether the property was contributory or not.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there were any questions or comments from the other Board members. Mr. Henry stated that he had researched Brutalist architecture and noted that it was primarily defined by the use of raw concrete, and he noted that he had not seen any brick examples. He stated that if the new façade did not have weep holes, it would end up experiencing the same issues that lead to the current problems. Mrs. Tennis stated that bricks did not have weep holes and Mr. Henry noted that they were supposed to be installed in the mortar joints between the bricks.

Mrs. Tennis asked the Applicants whether they considered in-kind restoration of the façade; they confirmed that they had invited one of the top restoration company’s in the state do testing and make recommendations. She asked how many courses deep the brick façade was. The Applicants noted that it was not a traditional brick façade as seen in older buildings, which featured two layers of brick that were cross-linked; they noted that the façade featured one layer of brick façade mortared directly to an underlying layer of CMU block, which did not leave room for a moisture barrier, and that this type of construction was not prevalent in post-1940 construction.

Mr. Hurst asked the Applicants whether it was their professional assessment that the issues creating their problems they referenced could not be fixed; they confirmed that the façade could be restored but that they were not sure they would be able to address the long-term issues. Mr. Hurst stated that he felt the current façade was a part of the downtown streetscape and would be missed if it

HARB Meeting Minutes

September 11, 2023

were significantly altered as proposed by the Applicants; he stated that he felt the proposed alterations were a glaring proposal from the current appearance. The Applicants noted that the proposal would only change 50% of the façade; Mr. Hurst noted that regardless of the specific amount, it resulted in the appearance of an entirely different building without reference to its previous history.

The Applicants stated that the primary question was whether a 51-year-old building should be considered historic; they stated that they felt it was a bit of overreach if that determination was made. They stated that the primary issue was that the actions they had taken with respect to testing and materiality were in conformance with the National Park Services' Preservation Briefs for "non-contributory" buildings.

Mrs. Tennis asked the other Board members whether they had thoughts on whether the building was a contributory structure. Ms. Bennett stated that she felt the building was a contributory structure. Mrs. Tennis and Mr. Hurst both concurred with Ms. Bennett's statement; Mr. Henry disagreed.

Mr. Knight stated that he had solicited comments from Mr. Grumbine (see earlier reference) regarding the historic, architectural, and aesthetic value of the structure and its relationship to the historic district, because he had less experience or expertise with similar issues as Mr. Grumbine or even the Applicants. He stated that Mr. Grumbine had been as conflicted about the proposal as the Board members but ultimately felt that while the building may not be contributory from an historic perspective, it was from a design perspective. Mr. Knight referenced Mr. Henry's statements about Brutalist architecture and noted that a Brutalist brick building was a unique example of that style; he also concurred with the Applicants that the building had a unique façade that presented challenges as far as how it weathered and its viability, and noted that even if the façade was recreated as-is, it might not solve those issues. Mr. Knight stated that while the Bureau's recommendation was that the proposal be denied, due to the architectural value, he would understand if the Board chose to vote otherwise.

Mrs. Tennis stated that she felt the loss of the building's defining features would be an overall loss and that the proposed design would not be an overall gain for the streetscape and district. She asked the other Board members their thoughts on whether the proposal would be a net gain or a net loss. Ms. Farren interjected and recited the Board's decision criteria as outlined in the Zoning Code. Mrs. Tennis agreed and noted that the issue of primary concern was the loss of the unique architectural features on the front façade and that she felt the conversation was within the scope of consideration of the Board.

Mrs. Tennis reiterated her question to the Board regarding the appropriateness of the proposal submitted by the Applicants. Mr. Hurst referenced the Applicants' testimony regarding the vulnerability of the brick façade on the upper floor, which was the most deteriorated, and asked whether they had considered less drastic options, such as covering the brick façade and window frames with an impervious treatment.

Mrs. Tennis noted that brick was a porous material that did required maintenance. She noted that her apartment building, Riverview Manor, had a similar construction with brick façade attached

HARB Meeting Minutes

September 11, 2023

directly to a CMU block wall behind it with additional concrete and masonry adornments. She stated that if her building, which was fairly large, was able to have the brick cleaned and repaired in situ, then the subject property could be likewise treated through repair and in-kind replacement. Mrs. Tennis stated that she believed the steel lintels supporting the brick façade had not been appropriately sealed and that it appeared that silicone had been used in some places instead of mortar.

The Applicants concurred that silicone had been used in some cases, but noted that the intent was to create a short-term solution to the lintels themselves being deteriorated and unable to support the weight of the brick façade and retained water. Mrs. Tennis noted that she had been involved in three masonry restoration projects and knew that the interior lintels could be replaced and sealed, which would last for a long time. She stated that once the lintels were replaced and sealed, it would address the freeze/thaw problems and the brick staining issues. Mrs. Tennis stated that the brick façade on the first through third floors looked to be in good shape aside from some minor repair jobs on the first floor.

Mrs. Tennis stated that she felt the Applicants needed to go back to the drawing board with respect to their approach to the project and any proposed design alterations. She noted that there were several well-regarded brick restoration companies in the area; the Applicants stated that they were working with one of them.

Mrs. Tennis asked whether there were any additional questions or comments from the other Board members; there were none.

Ms. Bennett moved to Deny. Mr. Knight interrupted and stated that he had one additional comment. Mrs. Tennis noted that there was a motion on the floor and noted the Board should vote first before Mr. Knight spoke. Mr. Hurst seconded the motion to Deny. The motion was adopted by a majority vote (3-1; Mrs. Gribble abstained from the vote as she recused herself).

Mr. Knight stated that he felt that the issue should be considered similarly to a recently review proposal at 1501 North Front Street, in which an additional story was proposed for the existing one-story building and the exterior façade would be updated on all four elevations. He noted that the Applicants may want to resubmit the project with more information regarding the contribution (or not) of the structure to the historic district and/or alternative approaches to the façade. He noted that while the Planning Bureau recommended denial of the current proposal, there may be other options that were more appropriate and acceptable to the Board.

Mr. Hurst stated that additional background on the history of the property and its contribution to the district would be unnecessary, because his vote came down to whether he believed the building was contributory and he believed it was. He agreed that he would like to see a more creative and conservative approach to repairing or replacing the front façade.

The Applicants inquired as to how long a building in an historic district would have to exist before its façade could be changed, and stated that they felt the Board was trying to lock the appearance of historic buildings in place if they didn't allow alterations. Mr. Hurst stated that it was not his intention to discourage any changes, but that he felt the subject property held unique architectural

HARB Meeting Minutes

September 11, 2023

value and was worth a greater effort to preserve and restore the building. Mrs. Tennis concurred and stated that the Board existed for the purpose of protecting properties. Mr. Knight suggested that the Applicants consider the installation of a solid, brick-colored header above the windows and noted that the Board would consider alternations that were sympathetic to the property and appropriate for the context.

Mr. Hurst reiterated that he was opposed to the submitted design, not the overall proposal to address the façade, and that he would be open to considering a more sensitive proposal.

OTHER BUSINESS:

Mrs. Gribble noted that there were some outstanding issues regarding Board members' terms expiring and reappointments. Mrs. Tennis noted that her three-year term was expiring in November and that she would be stepping down after that; she stated that she hoped the advance notice would allow time to nominate and appoint a new member.

Mrs. Gribble noted that Mrs. Tennis was the Vice Chair and the Board would have to appoint a new Vice Chair in 2024. Mr. Knight noted that the Board was required to nominate and appoint new positions on an annual basis, so they would be doing that in January 2024 regardless. He solicited recommendations for nominations from the current Board members.

ADJOURNMENT: 7:11 PM

Mr. Henry moved, and Ms. Bennett seconded the motion, to adjourn. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).