



York Historical Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes
August 11, 2016

Members in attendance included: Dennis Kunkle, Chair; Mark Shermeyer; Dave Redshaw; Justine Landis

Absent: Robin Pottorff; Becky Zeller; John Fox; Teresa Johnescu

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

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION/RESULT
Welcome and call to order Dennis Kunkle, Chair	The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm. The agenda was prepared by the HARB Consultant.	A quorum was present.
Changes to the Agenda		
Minutes of July 14, 2016		Move to approve by Mr. Shermeyer seconded by Ms. Kunkle. Approved.
Cases	The following cases are approved with the recommended actions.	

Case #1 – 221 W. Philadelphia Street

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness from L & H Companies (Michele Garvin and Craig Beach, representative from L&H Signs) on behalf of Densply for the installation of an illuminated sign on the façade of the property. Densply is rebranding and is proposing a sign consisting of brushed stainless steel letters with halo lighting that will provide lighting that bounces off the building to highlight the letters. Ms. Landis asked if the brightness would be the same, and the applicant replied, yes, and then clarified that the lights shine onto the wall and will not be projecting into the lettering. Mr. Redshaw asked if the signs would be at the same location. The applicant indicated that the signs will be in a similar location to the existing.

Motion: Mr. Shermeyer made a motion to approve the application as presented. Mr. Redshaw seconded the motion.

The motion was approved 4 to 0.

Case #2 – 232 E. Market Street

A request for a Certificate of Appropriateness from Tri Corner Communities LLC, for the demolition of a single-story, single-car, detached garage located in a parking lot at the rear of the property. The construction of a three story addition atop an existing, attached, five-car garage in the rear of the property is also proposed.

The applicant asked if they had to present to the board since the building was constructed in 1969. The Board replied that yes, they need too, because the building is located within the Historic District and the changes to the building will be visible from within the district. The applicant showed the front of the property and indicated no changes will be made to the rear of the building. The second photo showed the rear of the property which will be altered. The proposed changes to the rear include a three-story addition on the rear of the building. A total of 43 apartments will be in the building. Mr. Redshaw asked for clarification on if the addition would be visible from the front or the sides. The applicant replied that yes, the addition will be visible from the two side elevations but not from the front.

Mr. Kunkle asked about the name “Baker” which was shown on the illustration of the proposed rear façade and the applicant indicated that it was a placeholder until the project/building has an official name. Mr. Redshaw asked about the proposed balconies and the applicant indicated there are proposed balconies on all stories.

New windows are being proposed on the west elevation to mirror those on the east elevation. Approximately two dozen windows will be added to the west elevation. The existing windows, on the east elevation, will also be replaced. The Board asked questions regarding the details on the materials that would be used on the windows, trim, siding, etc... These details have not been determined at this time. The idea is to not imitate the existing building but to complement the existing building. Proposed materials include metal vertical panel siding that extends out from the building and slightly above the flat roof. An additional question was asked regarding the proposed roof deck and the balcony and railing.

The applicant noted that some windows will be 3-foot-wide and 6-foot-high vinyl windows. Mr. Redshaw expressed concern regarding these particular windows. Mr. Shermeyer indicated that the Board has approved them before however Mr. Redshaw restated his concerns regarding vinyl windows.

Mr. Kunkle explained that the Board will need to see a second application that discusses specific materials at a later date. The Board reiterated that any changes to the building – including new windows, new materials, etc... – must be reviewed by the Board.

The applicant noted that they are also proposing to remove the five garage doors on the rear of the building and replacing each of them with an open brick archway. They will still be functioning garages however there will be no garage doors. Mr. Redshaw asked about parking for the tenants and the applicant indicated that there is a parking lot across the street that provides parking. A small garage will be demolished in the parking lot and the wall surrounding the parking lot will be demolished as well.

Motion: Mr. Redshaw made a motion to accept the application as presented, including the demolition of the small cement block garage on the south side of Mason Alley and the concrete wall around the parking

lot. The motion also includes approving the concept of the three-story addition, however a second application will be needed to review the materials and details of the proposed addition. Ms. Landis seconded.

The motion was approved 4 to 0.

Other business:

Adjourning and next meeting **The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 6:25pm; the next scheduled meeting is set for Thursday August 25, 2016.**

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

DRAFT