



**York Historical Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes  
May 12, 2016**

Members in attendance included: Dennis Kunkle, Chair; Becky Zeller; Justine Landis; Teresa Johnescu; John Fox; Robin Pottorff (6:13pm)

Absent: Mark Shermeyer; Dave Redshaw;

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

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION/RESULT
<b>Welcome and call to order 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 April 28, 2016</b>		Move to approve by Ms. Johnescu seconded by Ms. Landis. Approved.
<b>Cases</b>	The following cases are approved with the recommended actions.	

**Case #1 – 54 N. Duke Street**

The applicant was represented by Ben Foltz of Yorklyn Construction Company, Inc. The property owners would like to add windows to the south side of the building facing the alley. The windows would not impact the mural and would be added to the addition that was constructed in the early 2000s.

Rich Reilly, the owner of the building, was also present.

**Motion:** Ms. Landis moved to accept the application as submitted. Ms. Zeller seconded the motion.

Additional Discussion:

Mr. Fox asked if the windows were clad. Mr. Foltz replied that yes these are wood clad Andersen windows. The double-hung windows will match what currently faces Philadelphia Street. Mr. Fox asked

what color the skylights would be. Mr. Foltz replied that the cladding on the skylights would have an oil rubbed bronze finish.

The motion was approved 5 to 0.

### **Case #2 – 19 N. George Street**

The applicant was not present.

**Motion:** A motion was made to **table** the application. Ms. Johnescu moved to table. Mr. Fox seconded.

The motion was approved 5 to 0.

### **Case #3 – 57 W. Market Street**

This is being presented for discussion, not for formal HARB Board approval. Mr. Musso presented the project on behalf of the applicant. Mr. Musso explained the building was a previous tax credit project and that the deck system that needs to be repaired was added in the 1980s as part of the rehabilitation project. He noted that the deck has been repaired and patched many times. Mr. Musso presented several photographs showing the conditions of the deck itself.

Royal Square Development and Construction is bidding this project and is looking for some direction to help prepare their bid package. They have specific questions that they would like discussed.

Also present from the applicant: Scott Bosse (Aeratis), Mark Kelly and Darryl McFarland (HB&G), Tony Matero (John H Myers); Meghan Schwarz and Kevin Hubble

**Item 1 – the columns.** The applicant would like to use fiberglass columns in lieu of wood for a number of reasons. The fiberglass columns have a lifetime warranty (wood columns have a two year warranty) and the fiberglass is easier to install than the wood columns. The applicant brought a sample of the fiberglass column as well as a brochure with examples. The color for the columns is also a potential issue with the warranty as well. A paint would need to be selected that is heat reflective and then that specific paint type and color would need to be tested by the manufacturer. Once the manufacturer has approved the paint then it can be used on the fiberglass columns and it would be included in the warranty. The applicant would like to retain the same color scheme if possible.

One issue that was raised was the neck-ring that is traditionally on the fiberglass columns. The applicant indicated that that portion of the column could be cut off if the preference was for a smooth column with no neck ring. The applicant also explained that the column “cap” is a 2 or 2 ½ inch square that is decorative (not load bearing). It would also be made of fiberglass.

Ms. Landis asked how the columns would be attached to the floor and she inquired as to what is there now. The applicant explained that typically there is an L-bracket that attaches the column to the floor. The applicant explained that they would use blocking to attach the column. They also noted that they are proposing to use a “Tuscan” style base that would be made out of urethane.

Mr. Fox asked what wood would be used if they went with the wood columns – mahogany or cedar. It appears that the current columns are pine. Mr. Fox pointed out that the cedar or mahogany would be a very durable material as well. Mr. Fox asked about painting the fiberglass – the applicant indicated that the paint lifespan would be 15-20 years on the fiberglass paint. The applicant explained that the fiberglass is non-porous with no expansion. The issue with wood is the expansion and movement that is inherent with wood and that it would show the wear and expansion more. Especially with the finger joints used to attach the pieces.

Another question was regarding the railing – the plan is to keep the existing balusters and replace the top and bottom railing. Mr. Fox asked if there was a block holding the railing and the applicant said no. The applicant recommends the use of an L-bracket or the use of blocking. Mr. Kunkle asked about when the building was rehabilitated previously and he mentioned a newspaper article that discussed a cable that ran all the way through the deck to help protect the building in case a car hit the building. This does not appear to be extant.

Ms. Zeller asked if the bevel on the four front columns would be replicated. And the applicant indicated that it could not be replicated on the fiberglass. The applicant also does not believe that it could be replicated on a new wood column either. Ms. Zeller feels that the bevel is important and it denotes the entrance to the hotel and more clearly defines the entrance. She asked if a piece could be applied (i.e. an applied neckpiece).

Mr. Fox discussed the decorative elements of the columns – such as neck rings – being applied and noted that he would prefer to see a straight column – no decorative neck ring – on the columns. Ms. Landis agreed.

The question was raised regarding the “Tuscan” base and if that would be appropriate and acceptable to the Board. Ms. Zeller confirmed that the balusters would be retained –the top and bottom railing are what will be replaced.

To summarize – the fiberglass is an acceptable material as opposed to wood. The Board is okay with the columns all matching – not recreating the decorative detail on the front four columns. The proposed columns would be 2/3 tapered and 1/3 straight to allow for the railing to be installed. Columns will be smooth – no neck rings. The paint color is still be determined.

**Item 2 – the decking.** The applicant brought in a sample showing a wood deck and a high density PVC deck for comparison purposes. The applicant would like to use the PVC deck and they brought samples and a booklet. The proposed product is tested to 160 degrees above zero and 140 degrees below and there is no dimensional movement in that range of temperatures. The applicant showed pre-colored products and painted products. The applicant can paint the product any color (including black) – there are specific brands/paints that have been tested and approved. The paint will last 5-7 years with foot traffic and longer without foot traffic, however this is all dependent on weather exposure. The product is meant to be painted. There are also color-through products that are available but the colors are not usually as acceptable to applicants and historic commissions. The product meets and / or exceeds building codes. They are recognized by the National Register on a case by case basis (case by case due to the potential to use color-through products). The applicant brought in letters from other historical societies who had approved the materials.

Summary – the flooring is acceptable as presented – either the painted system or the through-color system. The current floor is green to match the columns. The deck is not visible from the street. Mr. Fox indicated he would be okay with any color floor or floor system. The Board agreed.

**Item 3 – the handrails.** The current handrail involves a peg support system. Ms. Landis asked if the pegs were original and Mr. Musso indicated that he was not sure. Mr. Fox asked what the length of the railings are and the applicant indicated 12-feet - noting that there would have originally been a support at the half way point of each railing (6-feet). The applicant stated that their structural engineer would like to cut the railings in half and adding a support post however that is not the preference. The applicant indicated that bracing the railing is important for safety reasons. Mr. Fox suggested using a steel rod that ties the top and bottom railings together. The rod would not be visible from the street however it could create a trip hazard. The applicant has also considered adding a steel rod in the top railing for support.

Mr. Fox suggested a straight rod at a 30 or 45 degree angle that ties into the joists to provide lateral support. Mr. Fox suggested you could use two support rods per railing dividing it into thirds for added support.

Summary – the board is okay with a tie rod since it will not be visible. The end result needs to maintain the same look. Mr. Fox indicated that something metal would be better – anodized or powder coated would be best.

**Item 4 – venting and soffit system (pictures 13-16).** The applicant is proposing either a strip vent the length of the building or use of smaller circular vents similar to what is present in order to provide better ventilation. They are proposing two per bay of the smaller vents if that option is selected. The strip venting is two inches wide and eight feet long and it looks similar to an old school heating vent on a much smaller scale. The vents, as manufactured, are generally white. The small circular vents have screening, the strip vents do not have screening. Mr. Fox asked if they could present examples of the vents to show the board. Mr. Musso will collect the samples and bring them to the Board. Ms. Zeller stated that she feels the vertical vents would blend better with the existing building. Most of the ceiling is in good shape and will be retained. Damaged portions will be replaced in kind. Ms. Johnescu would like to see further small vents installed to mirror what was historically used.

Summary – Mr. Musso will provide the Board will examples of both types of vents for their consideration.

**Other business:**

**Adjourning and next meeting**      **The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 7:15pm; the next scheduled meeting is set for Thursday May 26, 2016.**

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