MINUTES

**HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**February 4, 2019**

**THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR. CITY GOVERNMENT CENTER**

**PUBLIC SAFETY AUDITORIUM, ROOM 213**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Andrew Knee, Chair

 April Rucker

 Camille Bennett

 Jeremiah Chamberlin

 Neil Heffelfinger

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** Trina Gribble, Vice Chair

 Anne Montgomery, Assistant Codes Administrator

**STAFF PRESENT:**  Geoffrey Knight, Planning Director

 Kristin Murray, Deputy Planning Director

 Tiffanie Baldock, Senior Deputy City Solicitor

**OTHERS PRESENT:** See attendance signature sheet

**CALL TO ORDER: 6:09 PM**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The minutes from the January 7, 2019 meeting were approved with no corrections. Ms. Bennett moved, and Mr. Heffelfinger seconded the motion, to approve the minutes from the January 7th meeting. The Board approved the motion by unanimous vote (4-0; Mr. Chamberlin abstained as he was not in attendance at the previous months’ meeting).

**OLD BUSINESS:**

1. **712 North 3rd Street, filed by Paul Peffley w/ MLP, LLC, to install a concrete ADA ramp with metal railings along the side façade and at the front entrance.**

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved with Conditions. The conditions were that:

1. Per comments from the Codes Bureau and City Engineer related to the Easement application that was submitted concurrently with the COA application:
	1. The proposed ramp landing at the entrance will utilize railings of the same design and material as those proposed for the ramp itself.
	2. The Applicant will reconstruct the sidewalk along Briggs Street towards the intersection with Susquehanna Street, including repair of the damaged sidewalk sections, construction of a formal driveway, and removal of parking spaces located in the public right-of-way.
2. The Applicant will relocate the dumpster that currently occupies the sidewalk along Briggs Street and presents violations of both the City Codes and ADA regulations.
3. The Applicant will remove current signage that is non-conforming and/or has not been reviewed and approved by HARB, including for the existing restaurant and health care businesses on-site, and submit documentation for those elements as necessary.

The case was represented by Paul Peffley w/ MLP, LLC (the property owner), 141 North Cameron Street, Harrisburg, PA 17101 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mr. Knee noted that the current application was “Old Business” and asked whether Board members needed time to review the application and supplemental materials; the Board members indicated that they did not.

Mr. Knee asked the Applicants whether they had anything to add to the case report. The Applicant noted that he hadn’t been able to catch all of the conditions of approval, but noted that the condition of approval referencing required reviews for businesses on-site was applicable to the business as this was their responsibility, per their leases. He stated that he assumed those business did not get approval for the existing signage; Mr. Knight confirmed that was the case.

The Applicant asked where the City preferred the trash dumpster, referenced in the conditions of approval, be relocated. Mr. Knight stated that it would best be coordinated with the Department of Public Works (DPW). The Applicant stated that he had discussed the issue several times with DPW; Mr. Knight noted that the dumpster could not be stored in the public right-of-way. The Applicant stated that he agreed with that assessment and that he had met with David West and Aaron Johnson (with DPW) to find a solution, noting that he had twelve apartments and two commercial units on-site, but that he wasn’t sure where he could store it. Mr. Chamberlin inquired as to who owned the surface parking lot behind the building; the Applicant stated that the owner of the adjacent building on North 3rd Street owned the parking lot. Mr. Knight stated that the Planning Bureau would initiate an inquiry with DPW regarding the proper placement of the dumpster. Mr. Chamberlin noted that the location of the dumpster had been criticized on various neighborhood forums; the Applicant agreed the situation was not tenable and stated he had taken steps to address it including meeting with the sanitation department several times.

Mr. Heffelfinger asked whether the property on which the dumpster was located belonged to the Applicant; he responded that the dumpster belonged to him. Mr. Chamberlin asked whether the City provided the dumpster to the Applicant; he noted that the City does not provide those to property owners. The Applicant stated that he had spent approximately $1 million when it was originally purchased, noting that he had previously submitted changes to the building for HARB review and approval. He stated that he had invested substantially in the building and reiterated that he didn’t want to have a dumpster on the sidewalk either. Mr. Knight reiterated that the Planning Bureau would initiate an internal discussion and would potentially need to invite the Applicant and the adjacent property owner to a meeting.

Ms. Bennett inquired as to how long the dumpster would need to be maintained in its current location; the Applicant stated that it was permanent, noting that the building occupied the entirety of the lot on which it was located. He noted that there may be a small, 18-inch access along the back of the building, although this was in dispute with the neighboring property owner. The Applicant noted that if the only refuse generated was from the storefront uses, refuse bins could be stored in the basement; however, he noted that the residents in the upper floors would not have access in that case.

The Applicant stated that he had been addressing complaints from the surrounding neighbors, and he sought to address the issues by securing the dumpster to a telephone pole via a chain. He noted that more recently, it had been placed against the building. Mr. Knight reiterated the Planning Bureau’s intentions to establish an agreeable location via internal discussions with the necessary departments or bureaus.

Mr. Chamberlin noted that another condition was the reconstruction of the sidewalk along Briggs Street; the Applicant requested confirmation on the exact location. Mr. Knight noted that the condition would not be applicable as the location of that issue was on an adjacent property owned by another individual. The Applicant stated that he had spent $9,000 to fix up the reconstruct the sidewalk alongside his property; Mr. Heffelfinger stated that he thought the sidewalk work looked nice.

Mr. Knee stated that while he hoped the Applicant and Planning Bureau would reach a solution on the dumpster issue; he didn’t know if that issue was under HARB’s purview. Mr. Knight noted that it was a standalone issue which needed to be addressed regardless of whether the Board included it or not, but stated that it was added to the case report to bring it to the Applicant’s attention and because it was relevant to the point of the proposed project in that it addressed ADA accessibility. He stated that if it involved a different project, such as replacement of windows, the Planning Bureau may not have added it as a condition.

The Applicant sought clarification on whether it was relevant to the current review. Mr. Knee stated that the Board may include the condition but reword it to ensure that access to the ramp specifically was maintained. The Applicant noted that the dumpster was located to the rear of his building and thus did not interfere with access to the ramp. Mr. Knight stated that it was a larger issue than the specific footprint of the ramp, noting that accommodating ADA access to the building meant ensuring complete access to and through the site as well; he noted that some of the issues required additional research and discussion between City departments. The Applicant stated that he was happy to engage in any such discussions. Mr. Chamberlin noted that the issue was larger than this specific site, referencing the issue of residential trash receptacles and replacement by City DPW workers after emptying bins.

Mr. Knee concluded by saying they wanted to reach a resolution that properly maintained ADA access through the site; he turned the conversation towards discussion of the design of the ramp. The Applicant referenced the condition requiring additional railings on the proposed stoop and asked for clarification; Mr. Knight noted that the submitted drawings did not indicate that railings were proposed for the landing. The Applicant confirmed that they were not in the submitted proposal and stated that he had confirmed with the architect that such railings were not necessary. Mr. Knee stated that he believed it would be a tripping hazard. The Applicant reiterated that he had questioned the architect several times about including the railings and was told they were not necessary. Mr. Knight stated that the condition had been included at the behest of the Codes Bureau; the Applicant stated that the condition was acceptable.

Mr. Knight noted that there would need to be some sort of access from North 3rd Street to the door, so the railing would likely not extend around the entirety of the landing. The Applicant stated that one of the architect’s concerns was that there was not enough clearance for railings at the landing which would provide sufficient space for turning movements. Mr. Knight noted that it may be the case that a waiver request could be sent to the State Department of Labor & Industry; he suggested the architect could coordinate with the City.

Mr. Chamberlin asked whether the landing could be enlarged to accommodate more turning movements if necessary; Mr. Knight noted that an easement could be revised to accommodate a different or larger design, so long as the appropriate pedestrian circulation space was maintained. He noted that an expansion of the landing would not change the appearance or materials. Mr. Knee stated that he felt that a post of some type may prevent tripping incidents on the corner of the landing. Ms. Rucker stated that the railing would not need to be installed along North 3rd Street, but could be installed on the Briggs Street side of the landing.

Mr. Knee noted that the Board may need to adjust the language of the condition, and asked whether the Codes Bureau would approve the ramp design; Mr. Knight confirmed that he believed that was the case. Mr. Chamberlin stated that he felt the language of the condition should be revised to state that the railing must conform to ADA requirements as determined by the Codes Bureau. The Applicant stated that he felt that was reasonable.

Mr. Knee asked whether Board members had any issues with the proposed materials; the Board members responded that they did not.

Mr. Knee noted that one of the conditions addressed the signage on-site and asked whether any of the signage was included in the review; Mr. Knight confirmed that no signage was being reviewed as part of the application, but that it was meant to address overall aspects of the property. The Applicant reaffirmed that the tenants’ leases required them to submit applications for signage approval. Mr. Chamberlin asked whose legal obligation the signage was; Ms. Baldock asked for clarification and Mr. Knight noted that both window signs and a projecting sign had been installed. The Applicant noted that one of the business had only installed windows signs, but that the other had both window signs and a projecting sign.

The Applicant referenced the previous appearance before the Board and stated that he had requested confirmation that future tenants could install necessary signage, although he stated that he understood they needed to get HARB approval. He stated that he hoped the tenant would receive leniency; Mr. Knee stated that he didn’t think it would be a huge issue, but that the tenants would need to follow the appropriate process, and Mr. Knight stated that he felt the signage conformed to the Zoning Code and thus there would be no issues in getting HARB approval. Mr. Chamberlin stated that if the materials were in-kind replacements, the tenants may be able to receive administrative approvals for any signage.

Mr. Knee asked if one of the railings was intended to be affixed to the exterior wall of the structure; the Applicant that was the case. Mr. Knee asked whether the Board needed to require that it be properly secured to the structure. Mr. Chamberlin stated that the current façade did not feature original brick and asked whether it was a veneer brick treatment; the Applicant confirmed that some of the brick was a veneer treatment and other parts were hand-sculpted stamps into concrete. The Applicant noted that when the previous façade had been removed, there were three or four separate building façade materials underneath. Mr. Knee stated that it appeared that the top of the railing may be anchored to an original brick face. The Applicant stated that none of the existing brick on-site was original brick.

Mr. Knee stated that it sounded as though the Board was fine with not adding such a condition to their final resolution. Mr. Chamberlin stated that he didn’t think there was any original brick in the location of the railing that would be a concern. Mr. Knight stated that he felt a condition should be added that the railing be anchored through the mortar joints wherever applicable. The Applicant restated that the façade was comprised of concrete stamped to resemble brick. The Board determined that the condition was not necessary to add in the final resolution.

Mr. Knee asked whether anyone from public had comments on the project; there were no comments. The Applicants inquired as to when a Building Permit for the proposed ADA ramp would be approved by the Planning Bureau. Mr. Knight stated that he needed Law Bureau approval of the Easement application; Ms. Baldock asked whether that application had been submitted to the Law Bureau and Mr. Knight confirmed that it had.

Mr. Knee reviewed the conditions from the case report and noted several revisions; he noted that Condition #1b was no longer applicable; that Condition #2 would involve the Applicant working with the City and the adjacent property owner; and that the Applicant would notify the tenants of their responsibility to submit documentation for on-site signage. The Applicant asked for clarification that the dumpster issue would not delay the approval of the Building Permit for construction of the ramp; Mr. Knight confirmed that was the case and that he would initiate an internal discussion on the issue.

Mr. Chamberlin moved, and Ms. Bennett seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff and Additional Conditions; the additional conditions were that:

1. Condition #1b would be removed from the resolution;
2. Condition #2 would be revised to state that the Applicant would coordinate with the City on identifying an appropriate location for the dumpster off the sidewalk; and
3. Conditions #3 would be revised to state that the Applicant would notify the tenants of their responsibility for submitting signage for HARB review.

The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

**NEW BUSINESS:**

1. **2041 Green Street, filed by Tim Riley with the Neher Group, to install six Simonton 6500 Series vinyl windows on side of house in alley-way and back of house.**

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the case report recommending the request be Approved with Conditions. The condition was that:

1. The Applicant will replace the windows on the rear façade with the same Andersen 400 Series Woodwright windows being proposed for the third-floor dormer on the front façade.
2. The Applicant will be permitted to replace the two-over-two windows on the third floor of the rear façade with one-over-one windows, to establish visual consistency amongst all the windows on the property.
3. The Applicant will ensure that any vinyl windows which are approved by HARB match the remaining wooden windows on the property, whether by coloration of the vinyl material or painting the remaining wooden windows and frames. The vinyl windows will also be colored to match the frames into which they will be installed, or vice versa in the event that the other windows in the structure are painted to match the proposed ones.

The case was represented by Brian Dudley and Robert Widmark with Home Depot Exteriors (the contractors), 7239 Browning Road, Pennsauken, NJ 08109 (aka “the Applicants”).

Mr. Knee asked the Applicant whether she had anything to add to the case report or wanted to make any comments in addition to the case report. The Applicants noted that there were two separate proposals: replacement of the two windows on the third floor of the front façade; and a separate window installation involving windows on the side and rear façades.

Mr. Chamberlin asked Mr. Knight to clarify the reasons for adding Condition #3. Mr. Knight stated that one of his concerns was that although the locations where vinyl windows could be approved because they were not visible from a public right-of-way, he felt that they shouldn’t display an obvious contrast in color from other windows on the property. He stated that this would ensure better visual continuity.

Mr. Chamberlin asked the Applicants to discuss the specifications of the proposed windows, noting that they appeared to be a vinyl product. The Applicants stated that the window was constructed with virgin vinyl, and thus did not use recycled vinyl which produced a bluish tint; they stated that it was “made to look like painted wood.” They also noted there were other architectural features to the appearance of the window, and included a corner cut to make it appear as though there was a mitered corner. They noted that the intention was to make it appear as close to a wood product as possible, while being maintenance free and longer lasting.

Ms. Bennett asked whether the product was able to be customized; the Applicants confirmed that all the windows would be cut to the size of the existing window openings.

Mr. Chamberlin inquired as to whether the Andersen Woodwright windows were a composite material; the Applicants confirmed that the windows were “full-Fibrex” windows, although the application had stated that the windows would be “Fibrex-clad.” They stated that the homeowner had requested that the Fibrex windows be painted pine green for the two windows in the third floor dormer on the front façade, but stated that all other windows would be colored white.

Mr. Chamberlin noted that the Board did not have purview over the color of windows; Mr. Knee confirmed that and stated that he felt the windows should be colored to match but that they couldn’t include it as a condition of approval. Mr. Knight stated that he realized the Board could not require a specific color for the window, but felt that visual continuity was important in the appearance of the property. Mr. Knee stated that he felt they should add a note that the Board recommended the installed windows to match the existing color palette, but that it was technically outside of the Board’s purview.

Mr. Chamberlin noted that the Planning Bureau had recommended the Applicants be permitted to replace the two-over-two windows on the third floor of the rear façade with one-over-one windows for visual continuity. Mr. Knight confirmed that all of the other windows in the property were in a one-over-one configuration. Mr. Chamberlin asked whether the Applicants were proposing to install one-over-one Fibrex windows on the third floor of the front façade; Mr. Knight noted the Applicants had filed a separate COA application for the use of Fibrex windows on the third floor, but that because the Board had authorized the Planning Bureau to administratively approve such requests, he had not included it in the current review.

Mr. Chamberlin also noted that the Board did not have purview over windows which were not visible from a public right-of-way; Mr. Knight confirmed that was the case and noted that was why he had recommended approval for the Simonton 6500 windows for the locations on the side façade that were not visible from Green Street. He noted that the rear façade of the property was visible from North 3rd Street.

Mr. Knee stated that he agreed with the Planning Bureau’s assessment and asked the Applicants whether they were agreeable to that decision. The Applicants asked whether that condition was only being imposed on the first-floor window on the rear façade, and that the third-floor windows on the rear façade were also permitted to use the vinyl windows; Mr. Knight clarified that he recommended the Andersen windows for all the windows on the rear façade. He noted that he was unsure of which windows specifically were being replaced and that he had developed the case report from the information which was provided with the application. The Applicants noted that there two of the replacement windows on the rear façade were on the third floor and one was on the first floor. Mr. Knight asked for confirmation that the other three windows proposed were on the side façade, and asked which ones they were. The property owner (Mildred Williams) stated that all five windows on the rear façade and one first-floor window on the side façade was being replaced. Mr. Knee asked whether the location of the window on the side façade was visible from a public right-of-way and Mr. Knight confirmed that it was not, but that that all of the windows on the rear façade were visible.

Mr. Knee clarified whether the Planning Bureau’s condition was that all of the front and rear façade replacements were to be replaced with Fibrex windows, and Mr. Knight confirmed that was correct. The Applicants asked whether the full-Fibrex windows would be approvable, and noted that the samples they brought to the meeting had wood interiors and Fibrex exteriors. Mr. Knee asked whether there was a differentiation in the window profiles between the two products; the Applicants stated that the full Fibrex windows had a flat sill instead of an angled sill which matched the existing windows. The Board members stated that they had no issues with that configuration.

Mr. Knee stated that it appeared the Board members did not need to modify any of the conditions in the Planning Bureau’s case report. Mr. Chamberlin asked whether there was anything for the Board to vote on, given the Applicants’ acceptance of the use of Fibrex windows. Mr. Knight noted that he could administratively approve the use of the proposed Fibrex material, but that the proposal to change the grill pattern of the third floor windows would require HARB review and approval.

Mr. Knee asked whether anyone from public had comments on the project; there were no comments.

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

1. **618 North 2nd Street, filed by Moon Chan, to install a hanging sign above the main entrance and a window sign in the front window.**

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

The case was represented by Moon Chan (the property owner), 475 Pebble Beach Drive, Mount Wolf, PA 17347 (aka “the Applicants”).

Mr. Knee asked the Applicant whether he had anything to add to the case report; the Applicant responded that he did not.

Mr. Knee asked whether the Board members had any additional questions; Ms. Bennett inquired as to what type of food would be sold by the proposed restaurant. The Applicant stated that it would be Asian food similar to Chinese and Japanese food but with a more Western-style focus.

Mr. Knee asked whether anyone from public had comments on the project; there were no comments.

Ms. Bennett moved, and Ms. Rucker seconded the motion, to Approve the application. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (5-0).

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

1. **Discussion on historic district regulations.**

Mr. Knee noted that a discussion on historic district guidelines was listed under “Other Business”; he stated that he wanted to ensure the process was moving forward and asked whether the issue had been discussed with City Council. Mr. Knight confirmed that the Chair of the Building & Housing Development Committee was aware of the proposal and was supportive of it. He noted that although the Board had an outline of the Table of Contents, they didn’t have a format for the document or a timetable for public engagement, so he hasn’t discussed the issue in extensive detail.

Mr. Knee noted that Board members appeared to be in agreement on the outline for the draft Table of Contents and that the goal was to make the document accessible to the average property owner. He stated that he believed he could fill in much of the draft document himself and that he didn’t need much assistance, but noted that he would appreciate help with specific sections.

Mr. Knee noted that the Board needed to figure out a public engagement strategy and a timeline for engaging historic preservation stakeholders such as HHA. Mr. Chamberlin stated that he was on the HHA Board and noted that they held monthly lectures and that they were usually looking for topics to discuss; he noted that HHA would likely be willing to discuss the HARB Design Guideline update at one of those meetings. He noted that the meetings generally attracted about 25-30 people and Mr. Knight stated that he felt this topic would draw more people. Mr. Chamberlin noted that HHA had a wide and engaged network through which they could publicize the document revision.

Mr. Knee noted that the document would include city-wide standards as well as additional considerations for individual districts. He noted that the Board should reach out to district representatives, and Mr. Chamberlin noted that many of the historic districts had some sort of neighborhood organization. Mr. Knee stated that he wanted to make sure the specifics of each district were not addressed before the overall citywide guidelines were established. Mr. Knight stated that the Board could establish the citywide regulations first, and allow the public to review and comment on those, before addressing the district-specific guidelines and soliciting public comments.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that the Board should have a public engagement schedule before discussing the citywide regulations so that they could assure the public they would have opportunities to discuss historic preservation at different scales and neighborhoods.

Mr. Knee stated that he needed assistance in establishing a public engagement timeline and reaching out to the community. Mr. Chamberlin stated that he would be willing to reach out to the historic preservation community. Mr. Knee asked whether he could get a copy of the existing HARB Guidelines; Mr. Knight confirmed that he could share that with him. Mr. Knight noted that there would likely be a substantial amount of changes to the current document.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that the Board should provide a draft document to the public and ask for input on how they would revise or modify regulations, but not necessarily start the process with an open-ended invitation to have the public state what they wanted to see in the historic district regulations. He stated that the public meetings should include feedback forms that asked participants to identify good ideas, bad ideas, and missing ideas from the proposed regulations. He stated that this would encourage people to consider the regulations from all angles and not just complain about specific topics or issues. Mr. Chamberlin asked how long it would take to get the document ready to present to the public.

Ms. Murray asked whether the Board was considering having a workshop at the first meeting, during which the public would split into groups and review the draft outline; Mr. Chamberlin stated that he wasn’t proposing to approach the meetings using that model. Mr. Knee stated that the Board would come to the meeting with the citywide guidelines already fairly well-established. Mr. Knight noted that minimum historic district regulations were fairly well established across the country, based on input from the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation. Mr. Chamberlin agreed, noting that the basic, established standards and guidelines should be conveyed to the general public as the “floor” for historic district regulations. Mr. Chamberlin noted that those guidelines should be conveyed to the public and discussed as the bare minimum in historic preservation. He also noted that some of the issues revolved around the public’s lack of understanding about what they were and were not allowed to do. Mr. Chamberlin noted that the Board should work hard to clarify the regulations and standards in a way that made sense to a layperson.

Mr. Chamberlin asked whether property owners were made aware of the historic district designation when they purchase a property; Ms. Rucker stated that that information was not provided. Mr. Knight noted that the City had a Flood Certificate process and that the Codes Bureau included information on the zoning and historic district designation on the response letter but that the Planning Bureau was not involved in the process. Mr. Chamberlin noted that the Board had previously discussed including formal historic district information on it as well, with directions to accessing additional information.

Ms. Rucker asked how the City notified individuals who purchased property in historic districts; Mr. Knight noted that property transfers required the submission of a Floodplain Certificate and reiterated that the Codes Bureau included other information in their response form, but again noted that he was not involved in the process, so he couldn’t be sure. Mr. Chamberlin asked Mr. Knight if he could provide the Board members with a copy of that document, and Mr. Knight stated that he could. Ms. Rucker noted that realtors could be a conduit for providing that information to their clients. Mr. Chamberlin stated that his realtor had appraised him of the historic district status which was relevant to his insurance policy due to the considerations of full building replacement value in the event of a fire or natural disaster; he discussed the applicability to the property he owned. Mr. Knight confirmed he would get that document and provide it to the Board members.

Mr. Knee returned the discussion to the HARB Guidelines and stated that he would attempt to complete as much of the draft document as possible prior to the March 4th meeting. Mr. Knight suggested that Mr. Knee cut and paste sections from the existing guidelines, as most of that information would likely be carried forward, and thus it would be easier to identify gaps in the existing guidelines such as for parking lot gates or satellite dishes, and find examples from other municipalities’ historic district regulations. Mr. Chamberlin stated that Mr. Knee should let the Board members know if he needed any help in developing the draft. Mr. Chamberlin stated that he would contact HHA in regards to discussing the regulations at their April meeting; Mr. Knee concurred that was a reasonable timeline and that meetings in individual historic districts could occur during the summer.

Mr. Knee stated that he felt Home Owner’s Associations (HOAs) should be referenced in the design guidelines so that new property owners were aware of other regulations that might apply to their homes. Mr. Chamberlin noted that the Bellevue Park covenants were stricter than the Board’s guidelines and regulations. Ms. Rucker confirmed that their neighborhood association sent letters concerning dues to realtors when they noticed a house was listed for sale. Mr. Knight stated that including HOA information in the document would be helpful and that it could provide hyperlinks to the websites of the various associations. Mr. Chamberlin stated that there should be a notation recognizing that HOAs may have standards or regulations above and beyond those of the Board. Mr. Knight stated that he wasn’t aware of that many HOAs; Ms. Rucker noted that Academy Manor, Bellevue Park, MarketPlace Townhomes, and Fox Ridge all had HOAs. Mr. Knight stated that individual buildings or housing projects did not necessarily need to be included.

Mr. Knight stated that including institutional structures in the discussion of historic districts and resources, noting that the City did what it could to maintain the integrity of structures it owned or managed, especially during disposition.

Mr. Knee stated that he envisioned having an appendix with every address in the city and corresponding categories that indicated whether it had any historic designation; Mr. Knight stated that he didn’t think that was necessary, and asked whether they need to include properties that were not in historic districts. Mr. Knee stated that people wanted to look up their property and know whether they were in an historic district; Mr. Knight noted that the Planning Bureau’s existing interactive GIS map provided that information and that property owners could utilize that tool. He asked whether Mr. Knee intended on creating a database with all 22,000+ properties in it; Mr. Knee confirmed that was his intention. Mr. Chamberlin noted that the appendix wouldn’t changed much once it was developed. Mr. Knee stated that he didn’t think it would be difficult to create the proposed appendix, and that he wanted it to be easy to use.

Before adjournment Mr. Knight introduced the new Deputy Planning Director, Dr. Kristin Murray, noting that although she would not be administering the HARB reviews or meetings, she did want to get a sense of the issues that were discussed and considered.

**ADJOURNMENT: 7:11 PM**

Ms. Bennett moved, and Ms. Rucker seconded the motion, to adjourn. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (5-0) and the meeting adjourned at 7:11 PM.