



York Historical Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes
March 26, 2015

Members in attendance included John Fox, Chair; Dennis Kunkle, Vice Chair; Mark Shermeyer; Dave Redshaw, Justine Landis and Teresa Johnescu

Absent: Matt Argabright; W. Craig Zumbrun; Robin Pottoroff

Consultant: Mary Alfson Tinsman, Cultural Resource Manager/HARB Consultant, JMT

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION/RESULT
Welcome and call to order John Fox, Chair	The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm. The agenda had been prepared by City Staff.	A quorum was present.
Changes to the Agenda	There were no changes to the agenda.	
Minutes of March 12, 2015	No previous minutes had been provided.	Approval of minutes was tabled until the following meeting
Cases	The following cases are forwarded to York City council with the recommended actions.	

Case #1 – 101 S. Duke Street

Representing the Applicant (Royal Square):

Zack Funt – Royal Square Development, Project Manager

Holly DeKarske – Royal Square Development, Development & Administrative Coordinator

Joe Musso – Owner of Musso Real Estate Development

The applicant proposes to renovate the front façade of the building located at 101 South Duke Street. The applicant presented an alternate proposal at the previous HARB Meeting and the application was tabled pending the applicant returning to the HARB with additional details. The proposed renovations as presented at this meeting include replacement of the first floor multi-pane windows with single pane-windows, replacement of the existing doors with modern commercial doors, removal of the existing cornice and replacing it an Art-Deco style stainless steel trim and the application of blue and black glass tile.

Mr. Musso (applicant) introduced the proposed renovations to the Board including historic photographs of the building and the area. He indicated the proposed tenant is looking for something more eclectic that would differentiate this building from others and that would differentiate the proposed first floor business (a café/donut shop).

Ms. Johnescu stated that she has admired other work by this developer in the area and that she feels they have previously shown respect for the historic fabric of the buildings that they are working on. She questioned why there was such a departure from this trend on this building. She noted that this building was previously the recipient of federal tax credits and that the façade had therefore been previously restored to the Secretary of the Interior Standards. *[At this time a copy of portions of the tax credit application were passed around]*. Ms. Johnescu asked if there was a way to find a middle ground with the proposed project that both preserved the historic integrity of the building while also meeting the needs of the developer. And if not, was there a different building that would better suit.

Mr. Musso restated that they are not trying to force anything on the Board and that they are trying to meet the needs of their client.

Mr. Redshaw stated that he understands the perspective of the applicant and that he had agreed to the previously submitted applicant with some compromises. This new application contains drastic changes from the previous application.

Mr. Fox stated that the proposed design is not “historic restoration” and that he cannot support this application. He reiterated that this situation is different than the building next door (105 S. Duke Street) and that the two buildings cannot be treated the same. The board would be remiss in their responsibilities if they were to support the proposed plans for 101 S. Duke Street. He further stated that he hoped that the individual interested in using the building would understand the character of the building and that Art Deco is not appropriate for this particular building.

There was significant discussion among the HARB board members with the applicant regarding the proposed Art Deco inspired alterations that were proposed. The board felt that the previous application was better suited, with minor adjustments. The board stressed that alterations that are reversible (such as awnings, painting the brick, etc...) are preferable.

Motion: On a motion by Mr. Redshaw, seconded by Ms. Johnescu, the Board voted 6 to 0 to deny the application.

Case #2 – 105 S. Duke Street

As part of the discussions involving 101 S. Duke Street the Board and the applicant also discussed the previously submitted application for 105 S. Duke Street (known as “Allyson’s”).

Motion: On a motion by Mr. Redshaw, seconded by Ms. Johnescu, the Board voted 6 to 0 to approve the application with one Amendment: that the applicant provide the Board Chair and Board Consultant the opportunity to review the proposed materials prior to construction.

Case #1 - 101 S. Duke Street- revisited

The applicant for 101 S. Duke returned with the proposed restaurateur who is looking to utilize both 101 and 105 S. Duke Street in order to better understand what would be considered appropriate from the Board's perspective for 101 S. Duke Street.

There was extensive conversation between members of the Board and the applicants. The Board worked to explain to the restaurateur what would be considered appropriate at this location and to explain why changes that are acceptable at some locations are not appropriate at others.

Mr. Redshaw explained that the building was a previous Federal Tax credit recipient and that a significant amount of money had been spent to restore the building's façade. Changing the façade now would negate the work that was done previously. Mr. Redshaw indicated that the only modern element on the façade is the door, which was replaced illegally. Mr. Redshaw further explained that this building is different than the adjacent 105 S. Duke Street which was previously altered in a way that changed the historic integrity of the building. 101 S. Duke Street was appropriately restored. Mr. Redshaw stated again that the Board does not have a problem with the proposed renovations to 105 S. Duke Street however 101 S. Duke Street should be treated differently in keeping with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

The applicant explained that their concern is to differentiate the first floor from the upper stories – and from the adjacent buildings – to draw in customers. He asked again what would be acceptable – can the doors be changed? The windows? Could the cornice be removed? Can the building be painted?

The Board indicated that the doors could be changed since they are already replacement doors. The multi-pane windows should remain since they are historic. The cornice should be retained as well. Paint would be acceptable as would awnings.

The applicant again stated that they want to work with the Board. Mr. Redshaw stated that the Board is keeping an open mind and that they want to work with the applicant to create something appropriate for the applicant that retains the historic integrity of the building.

Adjourning and next meeting

**A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Redshaw. Ms. Johnescu seconded. All in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 6:55 pm.
The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday April 9, 2015.**

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

DRAFT