



**York Historical Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes  
April 9, 2015**

Members in attendance included Dennis Kunkle, Vice Chair; Mark Shermeyer; Justine Landis, Teresa Johnescu, Robin Pottorff and W. Craig Zumbrun (6:20)

Absent: John Fox, Chair; Dave Redshaw; Matt Argabright;

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

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION/RESULT</b>
<b>Welcome and call to order Dennis Kunkle, Vice Chair</b>	The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm.  The agenda had been prepared by City Staff.	A quorum was present.
<b>Changes to the Agenda</b>	There were no changes to the agenda.	
<b>Minutes of March 12, 2015 and March 26, 2015</b>	No previous minutes had been provided.	Move to approve by Ms. Johnescu; seconded by Ms. Landis. Approved.
<b>Cases</b>	The following cases are forwarded to York City council with the recommended actions.	

**Case #1 – 335 W. Princess Street**

The Applicant was not present at the meeting.

The applicant has replaced the windows with modern vinyl windows and wrapped all of the trim. Photographs of the property illustrated that the windows and trim had already been replaced once with inappropriate modern units. Mr. Shermeyer noted that the new windows would have been approved had the applicant submitted the project to the Board prior to the work being done based on the extenuating circumstances (replacing inappropriate windows with inappropriate windows).

**Motion:** On a motion by Mr. Shermeyer, seconded by Ms. Johnescu, the Board voted 6 to 0 to approve the application as submitted.

### **Case #2 – 337 W. Princess Street**

The Applicant was not present at the start of the meeting. They subsequently showed up later and the property was revisited.

The Applicant has replaced all of the windows with new windows without HARB approval. The application as submitted is to retroactively approve the window replacements. The Applicant also wants to wrap the historic wood trim, replace the storm door and replace the ornamental brackets.

Mr. Shermeyer explained to the applicants that the Board is okay with the replacement of the windows and the installation of a new full-view storm door. However the Board will not approve the removal of the existing wood trim and the proposed modern wrapping of the wood trim.

The Applicant indicated that they are concerned about both cost to maintain the wood trim and the life-span of the materials. They also indicated that with respect to the wood brackets they would like to have them removed and appropriately repaired.

Mr. Shermeyer discussed two potential products that would be appropriate for use on the wood trim that don't involve wrapping the windows. Both products are more durable than the existing wood alone or any modern composite material. The two products that he recommends are Abatron and the West System Epoxy. Mr. Kunkle added that these are products that the homeowner can use themselves but that it is a process that takes time. Mr. Kunkle offered to meet with the homeowners to show them these two products.

**Motion:** On a motion by Ms. Johnescu, seconded by Mr. Shermeyer the Board voted 6 to 0 to approve the application with the following caveats: the modern windows and the modern storm door are approved; the proposed wrapping is not approved. The Board recommends using one of the two Epoxy systems discussed to repair the existing wood. If the condition is so far gone that the trim needs to be replaced the owners must have the HARB consultant review the proposed replacement trim.

### **Case #3 – 135 N. George Street**

The Applicant proposed to replace the existing cooling tower with a new tower and support dunnage. The new tower will replace an existing piece of equipment located within the penthouse. The replacement equipment will exceed the footprint of the existing equipment and must be located outdoors.

There was no discussion from the Board.

**Motion:** On a motion by Mr. Shermeyer, seconded by Ms. Johnescu, the Board voted 6 to 0 to approve the application as submitted.

### **Case #4 – 15 W. South Street**

The Applicant proposes to reconstruct the existing 2nd floor balcony. Proposed alterations include replacing the existing support posts and decking.

The Applicant was represented by Mr. Nick Sciortino, NWS Handyman Co. Mr. Sciortino explained that the existing balcony was constructed seven years ago and that was not properly maintained so now portions of it are rotten and unsafe.

The Board asked for more details on the proposed materials to be used. Mr. Sciortino elaborated that the wood used will all be sealed and painted. The ceiling and deck will be constructed of fir. The existing handrail will be reused. The main concern is to waterproof the materials and allow for proper drainage. The Board expressed some concerns regarding drainage, however the proposed work was considered acceptable.

**Motion:** On a motion by Ms. Johnescu, seconded by Mr. Kunkle, the Board voted 6 to 0 to approve the application as submitted.

#### **Case #5 – 104-106 N. George Street**

The Applicant was not present.

The Board expressed several questions regarding the proposed work that could not be answered at that time.

**Motion:** On a motion by Mr. Shermeyer, seconded by Ms. Landis, the Board voted 6 to 0 to table the application as submitted.

#### **Case #6 – 29 S. Duke Street**

The Applicant was present and asked that the Applicant be tabled until the next meeting.

#### **Case #7 – 101 S. Duke Street**

The Applicant (Royal Square) is proposing work will entail the addition of a canvas awning between the first and second floor levels, the addition of orb lighting below the awning, the replacement of two entry doors, the painting of exterior brick, the removal of existing shutters, and the application of Plexiglas over the original multi-pane windows on the King Street and Duke Street elevations. Additionally, an internally lit sign will be moved from the 105 S. Duke Street façade and relocated to the corner of the building at 101 S. Duke Street.

Mr. Kunkle asked for additional details on the proposed sign. The Applicant indicated that they would like to have a rotating internally lit sign. Mr. Kunkle indicated that this is not something that the Board will approve – that he recommends a stationary sign with a spotlight. Applicant thought this was an acceptable option and asked about the colors and size that would be allowed. Mr. Kunkle indicated that the size would need to be a zoning question but that any colors would be acceptable.

In regards to the two large commercial windows, the Applicant explained that they would be putting large single-pane tempered glass over the windows. They would use a vapor strip to allow the historic windows to breath and would reuse the existing trim. The Board found this acceptable.

Mr. Shermeyer asked what would happen with the existing shutters (which would be removed) and the Applicant indicated that they would be stored on-site in a safe and dry location in the basement of the building.

Mr. Shermeyer asked what the two proposed doors would be. The Applicant would like to use full-view modern commercial doors. The considered wood doors but the cost was more than double. The proposed

doors would be powder coated black and would fit the existing openings – no masonry work will be done. The existing historic door will be wrapped in plastic and stored in the basement for future reuse.

**Motion:** On a motion by Ms. Johnescu, seconded by Ms. Pottorff, the motion was made to approve the application with the following conditions: the proposed awning is approved, the exterior sign is approved as a stationary sign with a spotlight; the removal of the first floor shutters is approved; the removal of the doors and the use of modern powder coated doors is approved with the understanding that both the shutters and the doors will be stored in the basement; the tempered glass over the two large windows is approved, painting the brick on the first floor is approved.

Additional Discussion:

Mr. Kunkle asked what type of lighting would be used under the awning. The Applicant indicated that they would use globe lights matching those on the fire house across the street.

**Motion:** The Board voted 6 to 0 to approve the application as submitted.

### **Case #8 – Weinbron Building**

Applicant: represented by Mr. Todd Grove from Murphy and Dittenhafer.

The proposed work will result in new residential units on the second floor and continued commercial use on the first floor. The scope of work includes the removal of “non-original/historic” elements on the façade of the building, including signage and storefront elements, the replacement of doors and windows, masonry repairs, and repainting. Federal Historic Tax Credits are being used on this project.

The Board congratulated the Applicant on their proposal and use of the Historic Tax Credits.

**Motion:** On a motion by Ms. Johnescu, seconded by Ms. Pottorff, the Board voted 6 to 0 to approve the application as submitted.

### **Case #9 – Woolworth Building**

Applicant: represented by Mr. Todd Grove from Murphy and Dittenhafer.

The proposed work entails the demolition of a one-story section of the rear of the building to be replaced by a four-story residential addition with covered parking and a roof deck. An additional two stories will be constructed over the front portion of the original building, fronting on Market Street which will contain additional residential units. The existing commercial space on the front floor will be retained, and the exterior fronting on Market Street will be renovated.

On the portion of the building that will be retained, the applicant is proposing to keep the existing bays and commercial layout on the first floor. Where possible the existing doors and windows will be retained. The existing awning will be removed to showcase the existing scalloped stainless trim. The existing brick will repointed where necessary. The decorative pressed metal parapet will be rehabilitated and reinstalled. The upper story windows will be replaced with modern aluminum windows.

The new construction will add two new floors to the original front portion of the building however the new construction will be set back from the existing roofline. This allows for the decorative parapet to

remain and creates a small balcony for the residential units on the front of the building. Three stories are proposed in the rear over the newly created parking deck. A total of 21 residential units will be created.

The proposed treatment of the new construction was designed in to be sympathetic to the existing historic fabric while not mimicking it. The design will include a series of resin panels placed within a vertical rib framework of painted metal. Windows of various sizes will be set between the resin panels. The panels will not be used on every side of the building – only on the front and portions of the rear of the proposed addition.

Mr. Zumbrun stated his concern regarding the Market Street façade (the proposed resin panel system). The Market Street streetscape features solid quiet buildings with a dependable rhythm. He stated that while is in favor of the proposed new construction he feels that the proposed panels are not harmonious with the existing architecture. Mr. Johnescu concurred with this statement. Mr. Zumbrun asked if any other façade treatment has been considered.

Mr. Grove (representing the Applicant) stated that the format – the resin panels and the window placement – was done intentionally.

Mr. Shermeyer stated that he felt the rhythm of the street was still present with this proposed construction in a subtle way. Mr. Landis concurred.

The question was raised if the color scheme was part of the problem. Mr. Grove replied that there are several color choices and that the Applicant had considered several scenarios. Four or five colors will be used consistently.

**Motion:** A motion was made by Mr. Kunkle, seconded by Ms. Landis, with the Amendment that the Applicant return with a different color scheme.

Additional Discussion:

The Applicant asked if there was any way the Board could approve as presented due to timeframes with grant applications and funding. A discussion took place regarding the fact that the colors as printed on the model are not true representations of the resin panels. The panels were again reviewed by the Board.

**Motion:** A new motion was made by Mr. Kunkle, seconded by Ms. Landis, to approve the Application as submitted. The Board approved by a vote of 5-1.

Mr. Zunbrum was the dissenting opinion. He felt that the Market Street façade does not adequately represent the rhythms and colors or vertical elements of the rest of the block.

**Adjourning and next meeting**      **A motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Kunkle. Ms. Johnescu seconded. All in favor and the meeting was adjourned at 7:55 pm. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday April 23, 2015.**

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