MINUTES

**HARRISBURG ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**May 6, 2019**

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

**PUBLIC SAFETY AUDITORIUM, ROOM 213**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Andrew Knee, Chair

Trina Gribble, Vice Chair

Anne Montgomery, Assistant Codes Administrator

Camille Bennett

Jeremiah Chamberlin (arrived at 6:10 PM)

Neil Heffelfinger

April Rucker

**MEMBERS ABSENT:** N/A

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

Frank Grumbine, Historic Preservation Specialist and Archivist

Tiffanie Baldock, Senior Deputy City Solicitor

**OTHERS PRESENT:** See attendance signature sheet

**CALL TO ORDER: 6:00 PM**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

The minutes from the April 1, 2019 meeting were not available. Ms. Rucker motioned, and Mrs. Gribble seconded the motion, to table the vote on the April 1st minutes. The Board approved the motion to table minutes from the April meeting until June by unanimous vote (6-0).

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**NEW BUSINESS:**

1. **315 South Front Street, filed by Kimeka Campbell, to widen the rear second floor deck, install a new exterior stairwell to the rear, second floor deck, and install a new projecting sign on the front elevation.**

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

1. The Applicant will ensure that if the deck is expanded to accommodate a new staircase, the railings will match the existing railings in material and design and any new posts would match the existing posts, including the brackets at the top. Any new elements should be painted to match the existing or proposed color palette.
2. The Applicant will file a Floodplain development permit application for the installation of the proposed stairway in the rear porch.

The case was represented by Kimeka Campbell, 315 South Front Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mr. Knee asked the Applicant whether she had anything to add to the case report. The Applicant stated that Mr. Knight wrote a beautiful description of her home and stated that it was the first home on the block.

Mr. Knee inquired about the spindles or balustrades and whether or not they would be reused or replicated for the proposed stairs. The Applicant states that they would be reused and reproduced to match the original railings. The Applicant stated that the staircase would be a spiral staircase due to a lack of area around the base of the stairs for egress. The Applicant stated that the frame of the spiral staircase will be galvanized iron or pressure treated lumber and stated that she will replicate the balustrades from the deck for the stairs. Mr. Knee noted that trying to match historic materials would result in false historicism; the Applicant stated that contemporary alternative materials such as pre-fabricated iron are not architecturally sound.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the Applicant would be cutting the balustrades herself; the Applicant stated that her husband and cousin would be reproducing them for the stairs or rotten elements. Mrs. Gribble asked whether the Applicant would be using the same species of lumber; the Applicant responded that her husband has tried to match the wood from the deck.

Mr. Knee reiterated the conditions from the case report to the Applicant. The Applicant stated that some balustrades are rotting and will be replaced in-kind and that she would comply with the condition to submit the floodplain development permit application.

Ms. Bennet asked the Applicant what text will be represented on the new projecting sign; the Applicant stated that the sign will read “Hurston Manor” as well as “Young Professionals of Color of Greater Harrisburg.”

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

Mrs. Rucker moved, and Ms. Bennet seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (6-0; Mr. Chamberlin abstained from voting as he was late to the meeting).

1. **116 Pine Street, filed by Brad Jones with River & Pine LLC, to install two rows of windows in the northeastern elevation of the structure and to install a new utility room access door on the northern elevation.**

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

1. The proposed project will match the existing fixed aluminum windows on the rest of the façade in keeping with the recommendations of the National Park Services Preservation Briefs.
2. The proposed windows will permit the construction of the previously approved housing units in the building.
3. The installation of the windows will provide a more complete visual aesthetic of the structure. Had there not been a previously existing structure at the time of construction these windows would have been installed when new.

The case was represented by Brad Jones with River & Pine, LLC (the property owner), 320 Market Street, Suite 273, Harrisburg, PA 17101; and Kathryn Sterner with ByDesign Consultants, Inc. (the project architect), 1950 Market Street, Camp Hill, PA 17011 (aka “the Applicants”).

Mr. Knee asked the Applicants whether they had anything to add to the case report; the Applicant noted that a new door would be added from Barbara Street into a new electrical room.

Mr. Knee asked for comments from the board. Mr. Chamberlin asked whether the new windows would match the original or existing windows. The Applicants stated that the existing windows were installed in the 1980’s, are still manufactured, and will be used as an in-kind match for the new windows.

Mrs. Gribble asked for the location of the new access door; the Applicants noted that they will be installing the door on the northern elevation for mechanical access. Ms. Rucker asked if they would be using a steel door; the Applicants noted that they would use a hollow steel door with no windows.

Mrs. Gribble asked whether the Applicants had any plans for the parged area remaining from a previously-demolished structure. The Applicants stated that they did not have any plans to remove it, but had considered installing a mural there.

Mr. Knee asked whether anyone from public had comments on the project; there were no comments. He also asked the Board whether they felt the need to have any conditions for approval; the Board members did not feel that conditions were necessary.

Mr. Chamberlin moved, and Mrs. Montgomery seconded the motion, to Approve. The motion was adopted by a unanimous vote (7-0).

**3. 107 & 109 Locust Street, filed by Chris Bowser with Bowser Properties LLC, to install a shed dormer on the rear roof of 107 and 109 Locust Street to permit use of the third floors of both buildings.**

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

1. The Applicant may utilize either wooden or cementitious fiberboard siding on the face of the new addition.
2. The Applicant will not utilize the proposed aluminum clad wooden windows, but rather should utilize solely wooden windows of Fibrex windows, both of which are appropriate for historic structures.

The case was represented by Chris Bowser (the property owner), 62 South Terrace Road, Wormleysburg PA, 17043 (aka “the Applicant”).

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

Mr. Knee asked for comments from the board. Mr. Chamberlin asked whether the condition regarding the window material was acceptable. The Applicant stated that he would use either Fibrex or wood windows. The Applicant also stated that he will be using wood siding for the proposed dormer. He also noted that the proposed shed dormer would only be four feet high to allow better access to the third floor, so it would not be a substantive addition.

Mr. Chamberlin inquired about whether the Applicant had residential units in the two properties; the Applicant confirmed that he did have residential units, and was currently being heard by the Planning Commission and Zoning Hearing Board to establish another unit in 109 Locust Street.

Mr. Knee asked about the architectural renderings of the project; the Applicant stated that they did not accurately represent the structure and that the dormer will be a simple addition.

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

Ms. Bennet moved, and Mr. Chamberlin seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted with a unanimous vote (7-0).

**4. 254 North Street, Filed by Matt Long with Harrisburg Commercial Interiors to replace the existing first floor façade with aluminum storefront windows, install a new wall sign above the proposed storefront windows, and install a new glass and aluminum entrance door to the space at 256 North Street.**

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

1. The Applicant will secure a sidewalk use permit for the benches to be installed in the public right of way.

The case was represented by Matt Long with Harrisburg Commercial Interiors (the contractor), P.O. Box 100, Marysville, PA 17053; and Andrea Grove with Elementary Coffee (the business proprietor), 1727 Green Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102. (aka “the Applicants”).

Mr. Knee asked the Applicants whether they had anything to add to the Planning Bureau’s case report;. The Applicants stated that the new storefront façade will match that of the general aesthetic of nearby properties on 2nd Street.

Mr. Knee asked if the Board had any additional comments; Mr. Chamberlin stated that the proposal seemed reasonable.

Mr. Knee asked whether the signage on the front of the building should be further discussed or have other conditions applied. Mr. Chamberlin suggested that the Board require the signage to be backlit. Mr. Knight noted that the signage has not been finalized but will be in conformance with the Zoning Code, which would be a requirement regardless of HARB approval. Mr. Knee stated his concern that the new signage would be mounted to historic material; Mr. Chamberlin noted that there was nothing historic about the front of the building.

Mr. Knee asked whether the outdoor seating would be secured. The Applicants stated that the seating rendered in the design is not the type of seating that they would have, and that the seating would be submitted separately. Mr. Knight stated that outdoor seating is not subject to HARB review.

Mr. Knee noted that the existing façade where the signage was being proposed was vinyl siding; Mr. Chamberlin noted that below the vinyl had previous been rotted wood and that the property owner had replaced the vinyl siding with cementitious fiberboard.

Mr. Chamberlin reiterated that he felt the project was a reasonable proposal for the property.

Mrs. Gribble asked about the materials of the storefront windows and if they were composed of aluminum. The Applicants responded that he proposed three different material types to the Planning Bureau, though they preferred the aluminum store front design.

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

Ms. Rucker moved, and Ms. Bennett seconded the motion, to Approve with Staff Conditions. The motion was adopted with a unanimous vote (7-0).

**5. 1004 North 3rd Street, filed by Adam Brackbill, to install a new projecting sign on the existing bracket over the front entrance.**

Mr. Knight gave a synopsis of the case report recommending that the request be Approved for the following reasons:

1. The Harrisburg Historic District Design and Preservation Guide states that high-density sign foam may be an appropriate material for use in new signs and while this product appears to be low density foam, it is clad with aluminum sign faces which is a material that is appropriate for historic districts.
2. The Applicant is using an existing projecting bracket that is installed into the wood siding façade and thus a new anchoring point will not need to be created for this sign.

The case was represented by Adam Brackbill (the business proprietor), 306 North 2nd Street, Apartment 5, Harrisburg, PA 17101 (aka “the Applicant”).

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 the Board members if they had anything to add. Ms. Bennet asked about the proposed use and the Applicant stated that he was opening an ice cream shop.

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

Ms. Bennet moved, and Mrs. Gribble seconded the motion, to Approve the request. The motion was adopted with a unanimous vote (7-0).

**6**. **2015 North 2nd Street, filed by Wendell Hoover, to replace the existing wooden windows that were damaged during a fire at an adjacent property with Interstate Building Materials Architectural Series acrylic windows. This is an “after the fact” review.**

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

The case was represented by Wendell Hoover (the property owner), 2910 Parkside Lane, Harrisburg, PA 17110 (aka “the Applicant”).

Mr. Knee asked the Applicant whether they had anything to add to the case report. The Applicant stated that he believed the windows he installed were a one-to-one comparison to Fibrex, but that he discovered they were not; he stated that they were composite wood and were paintable. The Applicant would like them approved to have other options available to people in the historic districts. The Applicant stated that many people who follow the rules install the cheapest possible wood windows available which he claimed were of poor quality and ultimately resulted in costly replacements.

The Applicant stated that numerous other historic districts in various cities have approved these types of windows, and that he assumed they would be acceptable in Harrisburg. Mrs. Gribble asked the Applicant if he is aware of which historic districts had approved these windows; he stated that Washington D.C., Baltimore, and Scranton had approved of the windows.

Mr. Knee asked about evidence regarding the paintability of the windows, and referred to the cover letter from the sales representative, noting that it recommended using a paint that worked for composite materials. The Applicant stated that he had a conversation with a manufacturer’s representative and was told that the windows could easily be painted. but struggles to find evidence to support this claim.

Mr. Knight stated that the product information does not include the ability to paint the windows, but that the paintability was discussed in the letter from the manufacturer. The Applicant noted that the letter stated the product could be “stained or painted” to the customer’s needs; Mrs. Gribble clarified that that referred to painting the interior of the window and the Applicant concurred that was the case.

Mr. Knee stated noted that two concerns of the Board were the paintability of the material and the profile of the product. He stated that he would love to find materials other than Fibrex that the Board could authorize to be administratively approved, and that he wanted to find a way to approve such alternatives. He stated that he wanted to address all the concerns of the Board.

Mr. Chamberlin asked the Applicant if the windows that were installed were unpainted at the moment; the Applicant confirmed they were not painted. Mr. Chamberlin asked Mr. Knight if having the factory pre-paint the windows would be acceptable to the Planning Bureau . Mr. Knight stated that it would not be acceptable, noting that the next owner may want to change the color of the windows and if they had to send them to the factory to do that, it would not conform to the Board’s previous standards. He noted that if a future homeowner could not buy commercially-available paint products and paint the windows without voiding the warranty, then the product is not acceptable for a historic district. Mr. Knight stated that if a product requires specialized treatment then that would impose costs to future homeowners. He noted that the property needed to be able to adapt and change for new and future property owners.

Ms. Baldock asked if Mr. Knight saw specific language that the warranty would be voided if it were painted with regular paint. He stated that the only reference was in the letter from the manufacturer; he noted that for other materials such as Fibrex, the manufacturer would provide documentation specifically confirming that the material could be painted without voiding the warranty. Ms. Baldock asked the Applicant if he had such documentation, and the Applicant responded that he did not.

Mr. Chamberlin stated from his personal experience that the windows would likely need to have a professional apply a specialized treatment to be painted, and that the typical homeowner should not be able to paint the windows. Mr. Knee stated that it appeared painting the windows would not void the warranty given that the literature from the manufacturer states how the windows can be painted. Mr. Chamberlin stated that a tri-sodium phosphate treatment, as recommended in the manufacturer’s letter, would hurt the window far more than paint would. Mrs. Gribble noted that the temperature range of the material and the color of the paints may alter the integrity of the windows.

Ms. Baldock noted the Applicant had brought an associate to speak on his behalf. Mr. Justin Heinly (205 Harris Street, Harrisburg, PA 17102) stated that he called the manufacturer because he had considered this product in the past. He stated that the manufacturer recommended the windows be painted, although it was not clear if that meant factory painting or in-situ painting. He stated that the manufacturer did not indicate if painting would void the warranty, and that they would often paint the windows to match specifications of a project architect. Mr. Heinly stated that he felt painting windows was similar to removing paint from brick, which required “nasty chemicals.”, and noted that HARB had approved the painting of brick in historic districts.

Mrs. Gribble noted that some of the concerns she had regarded the sight lines of the frames, sashes, and divided lites of the windows. She asks the Applicant whether they are knowledgeable enough to speak about the product, and the Applicant responded that he was not able to do that.

Mr. Chamberlin asked the Applicant if they were using a one-over-one window pattern; the Applicant confirmed he was.

Mr. Heinly noted that the property next door to the Applicant’s has wood windows in place, and that the proposed windows had a similar profile although they were smaller by approximately a quarter inch.

Mrs. Gribble asked how the product was inserted into the window frames; the Applicant confirmed they were infill windows, which further decreased the opening size. Mr. Heinly noted that the subject property did not have wooden frames, but rather had brick openings.

Mr. Knight noted that the wood veneer of the window is only the interior side.

Mr. Chamberlin asked the Applicant whether he wanted to paint the windows in the spring; the Applicant confirmed that was the intention, but that he was not yet sure of color palette. Mr. Chamberlin noted that the Board may need to take the manufacturer at their word.

Mr. Knee noted that the Planning Bureau had recommended denial and that they could agree with that recommendation, approve the product as a test case, or approve it as an acceptable material.

Mr. Chamberlin noted that he had missed a previous months’ meeting during which the Board had approved another alternative material as a “test case.” Ms. Bennett noted that the product had been Homespire windows and that the Board had voted to approve it as a “test case,” but that she and Ms. Rucker had not agreed with that decision. Mr. Knee noted that that was a different case and had received approval for different reasons.

Ms. Bennett asked whether Mr. Knee was proposing another product to consider as a “test case;” Mr. Knee stated that it was an option for the Board; he noted that the Board could also state that it is an approved material.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that before any approval of a new material, he would like to see it installed and tested. He said he would hesitate to administratively approve any new material without seeing it be tested for a period of time.

Ms. Rucker and Ms. Bennett reiterated that the Applicant had not provided a statement from the manufacturer regarding whether or not painting the windows voids the warranty.

Mr. Heffelfinger stated that this would be a candidate for a test case, and

Mr. Knee stated that he was leaning towards approval.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that the issue with “test cases” was that the Board did not follow up with monitoring these products. Mr. Knight noted that the Planning Bureau had conducted follow-up reviews of installations of products such as Fibrex. Mr. Knight stated his opposition to approving a new material as a “test case” and stated that the Board was beginning to blur the line of what is an acceptable window product. Mr. Knight noted that the Board does not have specific metrics that constitute new window materials and arbitrarily approves windows on a case-by-case basis.

Mrs. Gribble noted that the exterior is composed entirely of PVC and stated that the Board had not accepted any other PVC products.

Ms. Baldock noted that the Board could table a decision until they have more information about the product and the warranty. Mr. Knee concurred with that recommendation. Mrs. Gribble noted the issue of approving of a new material without specific metrics and specifications, and simply approving a material based on a paint and warranty. She noted that the windows are one-over-one and are a simple installation whereas other lite patterns are not as simple. Mr. Knee stated that the Board reviewed each window on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that there were certain vinyl windows that have negligible similarities to historic windows, such as the window profile. He stated that if vinyl would be approved, then the metrics and specifications would have to match any existing window. He states that the Board will likely be reviewing a lot of different window products if a material like this would receive approval.

Mr. Heinly inquired as to why invalidating the warranty of the windows is an issue with the Board. Mr. Chamberlin stated that future homeowners may invalidated a if they paint a window and cause problems such as leakage, which would create a large burden on future owners. Mr. Chamberlin reiterated that he understood the Applicant’s issue regarding the paintability of the window and the warranty, but would like to have a specific statement stating that the warranty for the windows will not be invalidated due to painting.

Mr. Knee stated that he wanted to have the Board identify a way to approve the windows as an alternative material and wanted it to happen as long as it met the Board’s criteria. He asked whether they should Table the case and allow the Applicant to secure language from the manufacturer regarding the warranty. Mr. Chamberlin stated that it should be a condition to acquire information about painting and maintaining the warranty. Mr. Heinly asked that the Board approve the proposal as a test case while awaiting the requested information to determine whether to allow the product for future administrative approval. Mr. Knee states that other windows will not be approved during a period of a “test case” and noted that the “test case” review period for Fibrex windows was two years. Mr. Knight concurred and explained that other Fibrex widows were approved during that period because it was a product, and noted that it differed from the current proposals because Fibrex met the Board’s standards and conditions regarding issues such as paintability. .

Mr. Chamberlin noted that the current review is an after-the-fact review and the windows were already installed and that it thus would not prevent the building envelope from being secured and other work on the property being performed. The Applicant stated that the project was at drywall stage now and next steps would be installing trim and then painting. The Applicant stated that making changes to the windows would delay the project.

Mrs. Gribble inquired about the sill of the proposed windows and the appearance of the product and stated concerns about the sight lines that did not apply to historic windows. Mr. Chamberlin inquired as to how new windows sit into the frame and stated that he assumed there must be a gap. The Applicant stated that he was unsure and is unable to answer.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that he would like to see the application tabled, would like to see why the other historic districts have approved of the material, and would like to get a letter from another city’s historic district would help his case. He stated that the Board needed specific reasons why this material would be approved over other similar vinyl products. He stated that if the Board tabled then they must state certain conditions that must be met; Mrs. Gribble agreed. Mr. Chamberlin stated that he still wanted the option of rejecting other similar materials.

Mr. Knee stated that the Board was requesting verification from the manufacturer that the painting the windows would not void the warranty. Mr. Knight noted that the confirmation should include publicly-available paint materials and not just specific ones available to the manufacturer. Mr. Chamberlin stated the Applicant should include specific projects from the sales representative where this product had been approved in other historic districts. Mr. Knee also stated the Board should also visit the property and review the installed windows for themselves.

Mr. Knee asked whether anyone from public had comments on the project; Mr. David Morrison with Historic Harrisburg Association noted that the issue of windows in the preservation world is highly contentious and divided. Mr. Morrison stated that the Board should develop a specific solution to alternative window materials in historic districts and that a new policy should be defined by the Board. Mr. Morrison noted that a portion of HHA’s Board strongly opposed the use of these materials and that another portion supported their use. He offered to schedule HHA’s preservation meeting before the next HARB meeting to include a discussion on this particular product and on the issue of windows in general.

Mr. Knee stated that he did not want to approve “branded” materials, but rather materials that met specific metrics, based on recommendations from the historic preservation community.

Mr. Heinly noted that the adjacent building burnt down and that prior to that disaster, the majority of the windows on the side façade would not have been visible from the public right-of-way. He noted that the only windows on that would have been under HARB’s purview were those on the front and those on the front of the turret. Mr. Knee stated that the Board will work on reviewing the viewshed policy and public visibility during their update of the Historic District Design Guidelines. Mr. Knight agreed and stated that most of the windows on the side of the structure were not visible, and that if the Board wanted to approve the request, then approval of the proposed windows should be limited to the southern façade; he referenced a previous decision for 2008-2010 North 3rd Street that involved a similar situation. He noted that the Board had required any windows which would have been visible when the building was still standing to use historically-appropriate materials.

Mr. Knee noted that the Board seemed to support a motion to Table the request until the June HARB meeting. Mrs. Gribble asked for items that the Board was requiring of the Applicant. Mr. Knee noted that it should include verification that the use of publicly-available paint would not void the warranty and documentation from approvals granted by other municipalities’ historic review board. Mr. Chamberlin noted that he would like to have documentation, recommendations, and reasons from prior projects in other municipalities’ historic districts that had approved of this material. Mr. Knight stated that a third condition was that the Board members will visit the property to see the windows for themselves. He also noted that the Board would like feedback from HHA about windows; Mr. Knee and Mr. Chamberlin state that feedback from a third party should not be a condition.

Mr. Chamberlin moved, and Mrs. Gribble seconded the motion, to Table the request. The motion was approved by a unanimous vote (7-0).

**OTHER BUSINESS:**

Mr. Knight introduced Mr. Frank Grumbine, the new Historic Preservation Specialist and Archivist for the City of Harrisburg. Mr. Grumbine introduced himself to the Board members and provide some of his background.

1. **Discussion on rewriting historic district guidelines.**

Mr. Knee noted that he had sent Mr. Knight a draft of the proposed table of contents for the document; Mr. Knight noted that he had not received that. Mr. Chamberlin noted that Board members were supposed to get assignments to research different chapters. Mr. Knee noted that he had not gotten that information to Mr. Knight until recently and stated that he hoped the Board would have a working document to discuss with David Morrison with HHA by next month’s meeting. Mr. Knight stated that he would try to have the assignments distributed in time for the Board to do research before the June meeting.

1. **General discussion on historic district reviews.**

Mr. Chamberlin noted that with respect to rehabilitation of properties, there needed to be a balance between preservation and economic cost. He noted that he wanted to avoid demolition by neglect.

Mrs. Gribble stated that she would like to see a specific set of specifications for new window materials as opposed to requiring specific products. Mr. Knight agreed and noted that because the Board had not specified such acceptable materials and specific characteristics, he was hesitant to recommend approval of new window materials. Mr. Knight states that the Board needs to have these specifications and justifications. Mr. Knee agreed and stated that he wanted to establish specific metrics. Mr. Chamberlin stated that he wanted to adopt more materials that appeared similar to a person standing on the street. Mr. Knight noted that the Board should ensure they have a strong justification and reasoning for approving or denying specific products, otherwise they’ll be opening themselves to charges of arbitrary and capricious decision-making.

Mr. Chamberlin stated that a justification would be that the Board wanted to make renovation and rehabilitation of homes accessible to everyone. Mr. Knee noted that previous Boards had stated that cost of projects was not the Board’s concern, and stated that he did not agree with that perspective. Mr. Knight stated that he agreed with that to an extent, noting that more and cheaper options would permit more property owners to maintain their buildings. He also noted the need to allow cheaper materials because many historic properties were in the floodplain and that they were thus limited in the amount of investment they could make.

Mrs. Gribble stated that the Board should not be approving inferior wood products. Mr. Knee and Mr. Knight concurred. Mr. Knee stated that there was much to discuss regarding what the Board should agree upon for window specifications and stated that he wanted to hear from HHA on this issue. Mrs. Gribble stated that anyone not using a wood window should have to bring a sample of the product for Board review; Mr. Knee said it sounded like it contradicted their previous discussion on making the process more accessible.

Mr. Knight confirmed that he would be sending out the historic district guideline assignments, and that Mr. Grumbine will be working on the archives project and transferring the City archives to the new State Archive building. Mr. Chamberlin asked when the State Archives building would be finalized; Mr. Knight confirmed that it would be around 2020 or 2021. He noted that he wasn’t sure exactly what was up in the City’s current archives.

Mr. Morrison extended an invitation to all the Board members to attend HHA’s preservation meeting before the nest HARB meeting. Mr. Chamberlin asked that the meeting be scheduled for after 5:30 PM because it was difficult for him to get from work.

Mr. Matt Long with Harrisburg Commercial Interiors asked the Board whether they wanted to lower their standards regarding windows in historic districts. He noted that he had presented projects before the Board involving materials that had not previously been approved. He stated that the decisions made by HARB should not be dependent upon what other historic districts have approved; he noted that he had reviewed projects in historic districts in Baltimore and that he didn’t think HARB should necessarily accept that standard of approval. Mr. Knight agreed and stated each historic district approves is based on the context of each city or historic district, noting that Savannah, Georgia may think Harrisburg’s approved materials were unacceptable.

**ADJOURNMENT: 7:34 PM**

Mr. Chamberlin moved, and Ms. Bennet seconded the motion, to adjourn. The motion was adopted by unanimous vote (7-0) and the meeting adjourned at 7:34 PM.