



**York Historical Architectural Review Board**  
**Meeting Minutes**  
**December 8, 2016**

Members in attendance included: Dennis Kunkle, Chair; John Fox; Robin Pottorff; Teresa Johnescu  
 Absent: Becky Zeller; Mark Shermeyer; Dave Redshaw; Justine Landis  
 Consultant: Mary Alfson Tinsman, JMT Cultural Resource Manager/ HARB Consultant

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION/RESULT
<b>Welcome and call to order</b> <b>Dennis Kunkle, Chair</b>	The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm.  The agenda was prepared by the HARB Consultant.	A quorum was present.
<b>Changes to the Agenda</b>		
<b>Minutes of November 10, 2016</b>		Move to approve by Mr. Fox seconded by Ms. Johnescu Approved.
<b>Cases</b>	The following cases are presented with the recommended actions.	

**Case #1 – 156 W. Philadelphia Street**

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness from Royal Square Development for the replacement of five (5) windows on the rear of the building.

The applicant would like to replace five (5) windows on the property. The applicant’s representative was present to discuss the project. The applicant indicated that they were unsure what appropriate windows would be and were hoping for input and advice from the Board. They plan to get the windows from John H. Myers and the windows will be ordered to fit the openings.

The windows that the applicant was looking at are wood clad windows. Mr. Fox indicated that no vinyl would be accepted. He further stated that a wood window should match what is in the window already (i.e. double-hung sash). The applicant indicated that the second story are three-over-three and the rear first floor are one-over-one. Mr. Fox indicated that the one-over-one are likely not original.

Mr. Fox recommends that the applicant bring a sample of the window to the HARB to review. He recommended looking at the various options to try to match the front windows as close as possible. Ms. Johnescu approved of the plan put forth by Mr. Fox.

**Motion:** Ms. Pottorff made a motion to approve the application with the direction given by Mr. Fox to be approved by the HARB consultant. Mr. Fox seconded.

The motion was approved 4 to 0.

## **Case #2 – 101-107 S Duke Street**

A request by Adomia Enterprises, LLC, for proposed signage, painting of unpainted brick surfaces, door replacement, and other modifications to the property.

Mr. Musso presented the application for property. He indicated that the applicant had recently painted over the turquoise color on the first floor (approved by HARB via a Staff Review). Mr. Musso explained that the two properties are connected inside and they function as one property. All permits, including the liquor permit, apply to both properties.

Mr. Musso introduced to the applicants to the HARB Board. “Taste Test” is the business that will be moving into these spaces. It is an opportunity for new restaurateurs to test their ideas out to find something that works, including food/labor costing, menu development, marketing, etc. When a business is ready they do a “test” with a limited public market to see what the reaction of the public is to the proposed restaurant and menu. In 101 S. Duke Street, there will be a café to serve the community – simple breakfast, lunch, and a coffee shop. The “Taste Test” part of the business would be located in 101 S. Duke Street on a limited basis. If the business appeared successful they would move into 105-107 S. Duke Street portion of the property (the old Allison’s) and run for approximately three months. The café would remain open as a separate operation. If the businesses appear successful, then “Taste Test” would help them refine their business plans and help them find a location in York for a full restaurant.

Mr. Fox interjected asked how the bullet points for the proposed work were created (these points were included in the HARB application). Mr. Musso indicated that they were generated by his clients and he is helping to present them on his client’s behalf. Mr. Fox indicated that of particular concern is the proposed painting on unpainted brick.

Mr. Musso went through the bullet points one at a time to discuss with the Board.

1. Replacement of both sides of an existing, internally lit sign that reads “Allison’s Restaurant” with new sign faces to read “Taste.”

There is an internally lit sign that exists on the building which is grandfathered in due to its age. It will now say “Taste Test” and it will be lit internally. The size, location, materials will remain the same.

2. Replacement of an existing wooden door on the property at 105 S Duke Street with a new, aluminum and glass storefront door to match the door at 101 S Duke Street. Also replacement of an existing wooden door on the second floor (apartment entrance) of 107 S Duke Street with a new, flat steel door, which will be painted to match the existing brick.

The applicant would like to replace the existing 105 S. Duke Street door with a storefront, black door, with a push bar in the middle which would match the door at 101 S. Duke Street. The 107 S. Duke Street door goes to the upstairs apartments. They would like to replace it with a flat steel door painted black. After reviewing the drawing Mr. Fox stated that the proposed door to 107 S. Duke Street would be okay, but he would like the applicant to consider an alternative that would match the proposed door for 105 S. Duke Street.

3. Painting of existing, **unpainted** brick above the existing painted brick at 105 and 107 S Duke Street. The new painting is proposed to extend 32 inches above the existing unpainted brick and is intended to be a visual extension of the existing black awnings at 101 and 103 S Duke Street. Also painting of a “RESTAURANT” sign with an arrow above 105-107 S Duke Street.

The applicant would like visually extend the awning line by painting another 32 inches of the brick black – the awning can’t be extended due to the oriel window that is on the building. They would also like to paint a sign saying “Restaurant” onto the newly painted black brick. The reason that they would like to do it is to better unify the buildings and have symmetry in the exteriors. The other option would be to put a sign up that says “Restaurant” instead of painting the sign onto the brick. The proposed sign would be approximately 12 square feet.

Mr. Fox asked if the other proposed painted signs would be on already painted brick. The applicant indicated that yes, the other proposed signs would be painted onto previously painted brick. In addition, the applicant is also proposing to install two letterboards (similar to a movie theater sign) that will allow them to change the message/name depending on the restaurant idea that is being tested. Mr. Kunkle asked how these will be illuminated and Mr. Musso explained it will be a wooden box sign. There will be canned lights within the box to illuminate the signs.

4. Installation of a wooden box header above the existing brick columns along the 105-107 S Duke Street façade, which formerly held a wooden box sign which read “Alison’s Restaurant”.

The Board had no objections to this item.

5. Removal of existing glass block at 105 S Duke street and installation of a “small brick base” in order to install a new garage door, which will span the full width of the new opening and roll up into the interior of the space when open.

Mr. Fox asked what the purpose of the proposed door is. The applicant indicated that it would allow for some exterior seating as well as fresh air for the building. Mr. Fox stated that he would like to see the glass block removed as it is not original to the building.

Additional discussion followed between the applicant and the Board. Mr. Fox noted that the only proposed item that he had an issue with is the proposed painting of additional unpainted brick. He indicated that he would prefer to see the applicant not paint any additional signs on the building (on previously painted brick) but that HARB guidelines allow it. Ms. Johnescu asked if the awning could be extended, and then noted that it could not be because of the oriel window.

Ms. Pottorff indicated that she is also not in favor of painting the brick, but she likes the symmetry it creates. Mr. Fox recommended painting a piece of plywood black and attaching that to the building instead of painting the brick. The wood could be attached to the front of the building (in the mortar). He also recommended creating small “ledge” on top of the sign (with PVC or other material) to keep water off the wooden sign. This small ledge could also be at the same angle as the awning to keep a consistent look and symmetry to the building. This would prevent painting the brick and would create more depth to the sign.

Ms. Johnescu agreed that this would be more in keeping with the awning and would be more appropriate to the building. The applicant noted one area that would be an issue where there is a downspout is coming down. Mr. Fox suggested painting the downspouts black to help “hide” them.

Mr. Kunkle noted that if the oriel window wasn’t present the Board would have approved a continuation of the awning. He further noted that the black paint on the brick is permanent and not reversible which is part of the concern that the Board has.

The applicant asked if they could do a vinyl wrap on the brick and Mr. Fox indicated that would not be a good option since you would have to use an adhesive to glue the vinyl to the brick. The applicant noted that their main concern is having to replace the plywood sign every two years. Mr. Kunkle indicated that if appropriate plywood is used – and treated properly – then it should last longer. Mr. Fox noted that the applicant’s proposed use of the building and the focus of the applicant is tremendous and important to development in the City. Mr. Fox noted that he would be happy to meet with the applicant to further discuss how to create the plywood sign.

**Motion:** Mr. Fox made a motion to approve the application as presented with one exception. The proposed additional painting on the unpainted brick is not approved. As an alternative, the applicant can add a plywood sign that is painted black with the “Restaurant” sign on it. Ms. Pottorff seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 4 to 0.

**Other business:**

**Adjourning and next meeting**      **The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 6:50pm; the next scheduled meeting is set for Thursday January 12, 2016.**

**Minutes recorded by Mary Alfson Tinsman, JMT Cultural Resource Professional/ HARB Consultant.**