



**York Historical Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes
April 28, 2016**

Members in attendance included Dennis Kunkle, Chair; Mark Shermeyer; Dave Redshaw, Justine Landis, Theresa Johnescu, and Rebecca Zeller.

Absent: Robyn Pottorff, Vice Chair; John Fox

Consultant: Christine Leggio, Architectural Historian/HARB Consultant, JMT

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION/RESULT
Welcome and call to order Dennis Kunkle, Chair	The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm.	A quorum was present.
Changes to the Agenda	There were no changes to the agenda.	
Minutes of April 14, 2016	No errors or omissions were noted	On a motion by Mark Shermeyer, seconded by Theresa Johnescu, the Board voted unanimously to approve the April 14, 2016 minutes.
Cases	The following cases are forwarded to York City council with the recommended actions.	

Case #1 – 366 E Market Street

Owner Mark Lentz has proposed the replacement of the existing wood windows on the front façade of the property at 366 E Market Street. The proposed replacements are Weathersheild aluminum clad wood windows with a six-over-six muntin grid between the glass panes.

Discussion: Mr. Lentz stated that he would like to replace the existing windows, which are in poor condition, with new Weathersheild aluminum clad windows in black with internal grilles. Mr. Lentz showed the Board photographs of the current existing wood windows. He stated that no wrapping of the wood frames is proposed.

Mr. Redshaw noted that the windows on the first floor are two-over-two double hung wood sash windows, while the windows on the upper story are six-over-six and inquired as to whether the applicant

was proposing six-over-six windows on both stories. Mr. Lentz indicated that he did not believe the two-over-two windows on the first story are original, based on differences in construction and condition between the two window types, and that he is proposing to replace all the windows on the front façade with the six-over-six muntin style.

Mr. Redshaw asked the applicant to clarify whether the existing window frames and moldings would be altered in the proposed work, and the applicant indicated that they would not. Mr. Redshaw then asked whether the stiles and rails on the proposed replacement windows would match the existing windows proportionally, and the applicant stated that they would be as close as possible to the proportions of the existing windows.

Mr. Shermeyer stated that Weathersheild windows are commonly approved, but the bigger issue for the Board to consider is the condition of the existing windows and whether they could be repaired rather than replaced, and the fact that between-the-glass and snap-in muntins are not typically permitted in the Historic District and that a simulated divided light is preferred.

Mr. Lentz proceeded to show the Board several photographs of windows with vinyl muntins and wrapped window frames within the historic district. These included photographs of properties on East Market Street, North Pine Street, and South Beaver Street, as well as the Keystone Color Works which has vinyl windows which were approved by the Board.

The Board indicated that all of the vinyl windows shown in the photographs had been installed without Board approval except for the ones at the Keystone Color Works, which had been approved under special circumstances given that no original windows were still extant in the building at the time of its rehabilitation and that the building is an industrial property in an industrial area of the City.

Mr. Redshaw asked the Board whether they could approve them if they were one-over-one windows. Mr. Shermeyer indicated that it would depend on the deterioration of the windows. He stated that typically, it would be recommended that the windows be repaired and if that was not possible that single pane wood replacements be fabricated as replacements. He stated that typically, when these types of modern replacement windows are found in the district they have been installed without approval.

Ms. Johnescu stated that the lack of enforcement of HARB rulings on window replacements puts the Board in an awkward position as illegal windows are prevalent throughout the district. She stated that the Board must consistently make rulings according to HARB guidelines and the City has the liberty to overturn those rulings and is accountable for the non-compliant windows throughout the district.

Motion: A motion was made by Ms. Johnescu, seconded by Mr. Redshaw, to deny the application as presented.

Additional Discussion: The applicant gave further examples of similar windows having been installed in the district and stated that his windows are beyond repair and must be replaced. The Board indicated that he could appeal their ruling to City Council.

Mr. Redshaw asked the applicant whether he had received the professional recommendations of the HARB consultant, and the applicant stated that he had, although his wife indicated that they had not. Mr. Redshaw asked the applicant to consider the recommendations made, but the applicant cited his previous position that similar windows had been approved in other instances and should be approved in his case.

The Board continued to deliberate on what types of windows they could approve, however, the applicant would not consider any recommendations, stated that the discussion was over and left the meeting before votes were taken.

Motion: The motion to deny the application was approved 6 to 0.

Case #2 – 411 E Market Street

Owner Holger Koehler has proposed the restoration of the existing porch on the property at 411 E Market Street, to include the in-kind replacement of deteriorated wood elements as necessary, and the installation of a railing on the porch roof to allow for its use as a deck to be accessed by an existing door on the second story.

Discussion: The applicant indicated that he wants to restore the original porch on the property.

Mr. Shermeyer indicated that the building is a significant house in the district.

The Board indicated that the proposed porch restoration is appropriate, but that the question related to the design of the proposed railing at the roof line. Ms. Johnescu stated that the proposed railing should not attempt to imitate a historic wood railing but rather should be complimentary to the existing design.

Mr. Shermeyer indicated that the railing would need to be 36 inches to comply with building codes, although the historic railing likely would have been shorter. The Board agreed that a simple railing would be best, and Mr. Shermeyer indicated that the architect of the home was known for mixing unusual materials as well as Spanish and shingle style architectural elements. He indicated that a wrought iron railing may be appropriate.

Mr. Kunkle asked the applicant to clarify whether he was proposing to install a roof deck over the top of the porch roof or if the intention was to have the deck and the roof be one and the same. The applicant stated that the door would provide access to the roof top, and there would be no deck installed over the roof.

Motion: Mr. Redshaw made a motion to approve the restoration of the porch in-kind up to the roof level, as presented in the application, using cypress, cedar, or Douglas fir, indicating that the roofing material and railing design be presented to the Board before installation.

Additional Discussion: Mr. Shermeyer indicated that the roofing material would not be visible and would not require review. He stated that the railing would need to be submitted and could possibly be approved at staff level.

Motion: Mr. Shermeyer seconded the motion made by Mr. Redshaw. The motion to approve the restoration of the porch, with railing design to be determined and approved at a later date, was approved 6 to 0.

Adjourning and next meeting

The meeting was adjourned by common consent at 6:45 pm.

**The next meeting is scheduled
for Thursday May 12, 2016.**

Minutes recorded by Christine Leggio, JMT Architectural Historian / HARB Consultant.

DRAFT