



**York Historical Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes
January 14, 2016**

Members in attendance included: Dennis Kunkle, Vice Chair; Mark Shermeyer; Dave Redshaw; Justine Landis; Teresa Johnescu; Robin Pottorff;

Absent: W. Craig Zumbrun; John Fox, Chair

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

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION/RESULT
Welcome and call to order Dennis Kunkle, Vice-Chair	The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm. The agenda had been prepared by the HARB Consultant.	A quorum was present.
Changes to the Agenda		Additional item added by Mr. Kunkle
Minutes of December 14, 2015		Move to approve by Mr. Shermeyer; seconded by Mr. Kunkle. Approved.
Cases	The following cases are approved with the recommended actions.	

Case #1 – 22-30 W. Boundary Avenue

Carol Kauffman with the Crispus Attacks Association was present to represent the Applicant. The applicant is renovating the properties at 22-30 W. Boundary Avenue. The properties have been deteriorating over the last several years as they have sat vacant. The proposed plans are to turn the properties into three residential units – consisting mainly of larger four bedroom ADA accessible homes. They are finding a need for accessibility and are therefore combining properties into larger units. This will also help prevent congestion in the area.

Ms. Kauffman noted that the existing windows are mainly 1/1 however many are missing; others are simply boarded over. The rear of the property is where the changes are being made. Parking will be in the rear -one per unit which will allow for handicap vans to access the properties. Mr. Redshaw questioned if additional parking would be needed. The applicant indicated that they had polled their tenants and all but one have only one vehicle per unit.

Mr. Shermeyer asked if new windows would be installed or if the existing windows would be repaired? The applicant indicated that the windows would be repaired.

Motion: Mr. Shermeyer moved to accept the application as submitted. Mr. Redshaw seconded the motion.

Motion: The motion was approved 6 to 0.

Case #2 – 25-27 W. Market Street

Joe Musso represented the applicant along with the design engineer from Core Engineering. This application was previously presented however additional windows are now needed. Two windows and entry door are needed on the first floor and two on the second floor to allow light to the upper floors.

Mr. Redshaw asked about the previously proposed windows that were to be floor length windows opening outward. The applicant indicated that they had lost that occupant and the new plan reflects the new use of the property. The applicant would like to match the windows that are currently on the building, although none are on this side of the building. Mr. Shermeyer asked about the proposed windows and if the sizes shown were available in Anderson windows. The engineering representative agreed that it would be difficult to obtain the window sizes as presented. The applicant indicated that they were trying to get the most light possible at the location. The applicant indicated that the design would change slightly due to the type and size of the window.

Mr. Redshaw asked if the front façade was remaining as is and the applicant indicated that yes it would stay the same. Mr. Redshaw asked if the lights would be removed as they were added illegally years ago. He would prefer to see them removed and more appropriate lights added.

The board again asked about the windows and the sizes and it was indicated that the windows, as presented, would likely not be available. Mr. Shermeyer indicated that doing a pair of windows would likely work better with the sizes proposed. The applicant agreed that this was a viable option.

Motion: Mr. Shermeyer moved to approve the application pending appropriately selected windows to fit the openings. Ms. Pottorff seconded.

Additional discussion: Ms. Landis asked if the door would remain and the applicant indicated that yes, the front façade would remain the same.

Motion: The motion was approved 6 to 0.

Case #3 – 33-41 W. Market Street

The applicant handed out additional photographs of the property. The applicant indicated that they are replacing one set of stairs to the restaurant that are dilapidated and is a safety concern. The applicant indicated that at some point the owner would like to do a new deck and replace the other set of stairs as well. The Board asked if there would be headroom if they added a full deck. The applicant indicated that they are proposing to replace the stairs with larger stairs extending over and into the basement stairwell. The applicant also noted that the existing railings are not to code.

Ms. Pottorff asked for clarification on the proposed deck and stairs and if this application was for both and the applicant indicated that no, right now they are proposing the replacement of one set of stairs and the landing. The applicant noted that the deck is currently being partially supported by 2x4s that were added recently for additional support pending the HARB and permit process.

Mr. Kunkle asked what the materials for the new stairs and landing would be and the applicant indicated pressure treated wood that would be stained. The railing will be pressure treated as well. Ms. Johnescu asked about slip protection when it's wet and the applicant indicated that would be skid protection. Mr. Redshaw indicated that they could address the slippage issue when they stained the wood.

The Board asked who was constructing/designing the project and how they would ensure that the work is to code. The applicant indicated that they had plans from an earlier proposed iteration of the proposed work on the property that addressed the issues raised with the railings, balusters and stairs being to code.

It was further discussed that the application being presented is just to replace the stairs leading to the restaurant. The work on the second set of stairs and the deck will be part of a future application. The safety concerns with the existing restaurant stairs is what prompted this application. The Board asked when the other work would be done and noted that it would have been helpful to have plans for this application. The Board also noted that there are way to temporarily support the stairs until they are replaced.

Motion: Mr. Redshaw made a motion to table the application until plans are available and Ms. Johnescu seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6 to 0.

Case #4 – 53 S. Pine Street

The applicant was present and explained that the roof is leaking badly and is leaking into the house. The existing roof is clad in slate shingles and the applicant is proposing to replace the slate with 3-tab asphalt due to the cost. Mr. Shermeyer asked if any of the adjacent houses has slate and Ms. Johnescu indicated that the other properties on the street have asphalt shingles that appear to predominantly be 3-tab asphalt shingles and not Timberline shingles.

The applicant indicated that he would prefer to use a gray color shingle although the properties on either side have brown shingles. Mr. Shermeyer indicated that the using brown shingles would match the other properties and Ms. Johnescu indicated that the brown color would good with the brick. Mr. Shermeyer asked if the board wanted to make the applicant do brown to match the adjacent when the applicant wants gray which is a more appropriate color. Ms. Landis asked how different gray shingles will look from the brown and it was noted that the color will very different.

The Board expressed a preference for Timberline shingles (or comparable) over 3-tab shingles and a preference for a gray color. The applicant noted that they are okay with Timberline shingles (or comparable).

Motion: Mr. Shermeyer made a motion to approve the application for a Timberline slate gray shingle or equivalent. It was noted that the Board is allowing this to be different than the adjacent properties as gray is the preferred color for the shingle and it will set the precedence for the area. Ms. Johnescu seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6 to 0.

Case #5 – 312, 324-326 S. George Street

The application was presented by Nicole Davis with the Redevelopment Authority of the City of York. Mr. Shilvosky Buffaloe was also present. This application is a result of RDAs efforts to remove blight from the city.

Ms. Davis presented the application starting with 312 S. George Street. The RDA has been pursuing this property since 2012 and they obtained title to the property in 2014. The property was considered a public nuisance and violated the property maintenance code. With the time lapse while RDA acquired the property there was quite a bit of demolition by neglect. It is not feasible due to cost to redevelop the building and they have not found anyone willing to purchase and renovate the property, therefore they are looking at demolition. There are similar issues with 324 and 326 S. George Street.

Mr. Redshaw asked if any efforts to salvage any materials from the properties, in particular 312 S. George Street which is the most ornate. Ms. Davis indicated that up until now they had not considered salvage but that it was something that they could include. Mr. Kunkle asked a follow up question if they could sell the property for \$1.00? The answer was yes, but the question is what would be done with the property after it was purchased – RDA would need to be sure that the new owner would rehabilitate the property appropriately. Ms. Davis explained that there is also a concern with winter approaching and what will happen to the building if there is a heavy snow. There are other concerns with safety with the school nearby and children “exploring” the building.

Ms. Johnescu asked how a vacant lot would be maintained once the buildings are demolished and the applicant explained that they have a maintenance crew that they will send out. Ms. Landis asked what the use would be of the vacant lot and the applicant indicated that they could sell the parcel for development and in-fill or they could create an open space for the neighborhood.

Mr. Redshaw asked how many properties are between 312 and 324 S. George Street and the applicant indicated that there are three properties. The board asked how these three properties would be affected and the applicant indicated that the end properties abut the neighboring properties but they do not have a shared wall.

Mr. Kunkle again asked about someone buying the property for \$1.00. Mr. Buffaloe indicated that the purchaser would need to prove that they have the funding available to complete the project and to prove that it was a viable project. He indicated that the RDA is holding property owners and potential owners much more accountable. Mr. Shermeyer asked what they were looking for the replacement and Ms. Davis indicated that that would like to see market rate apartments/rentals. Ms. Davis indicated that RDA is being more proactive and they have been targeting this particular block to help improve the neighborhood and increase property values.

Mr. Buffaloe indicated that these buildings will demolish these by hand to salvage any materials that they can for salvage and reuse elsewhere.

Ms. Landis expressed her concern with the vacant lots that will remain after the buildings are torn down. Ms. Davis explained that RDA will own the site and the Bureau for Economic Development will have a voice in the reuse of the lots with respect to the integrity of the neighborhood. The applicant indicated that the lots will be seeded and fenced on all four sides to help prevent littering.

Motion: Mr. Redshaw made a motion to approve and Ms. Johnescu seconded the motion. The motion was approved 6 to 0.

Case #6 – 362 W. Clarke Street

Motion: This application was tabled.

Other business:

1 - 53 N. Penn Street

The applicant, Jared Louck, previously presented his application to replace the windows on the building at the December 10, 2015 HARB meeting. At that time he presented a type of window (Interstate Window & Door Company) that the Board was not familiar with. At this current meeting he was accompanied by a salesman from Interstate who brought literature about the produce as well as samples.

The applicant brought a representative from Interstate to show the Board the window samples. The windows are a composite product with a wood veneer on the inside and a composite coated on the exterior. Mr. Redshaw asked where the company was located and the salesman indicated that the windows are manufactured in Pittston, PA. Mr. Shermeyer and the representative from Interstate had a discussion regarding the brick mold that can be applied to the exterior of the window which would provide a more traditional window appearance. The window itself would fit into the existing window jam.

Mr. Redshaw expressed his concern that this window appears to be a more a traditional vinyl window in both material and appearance. Mr. Shermeyer indicated that he feels that this window is similar to windows that the Board has approved in the past.

Motion: Ms. Landis moved to approve the window for this property. Ms. Pottorff seconded. The vote was 5-1.

Mr. Redshaw was the dissenting opinion. He stated that this window type is inappropriate in the historic district and he will not approve the installation of vinyl windows within the historic district.

2 – 18 N. Penn Street

Mr. Kunkle presented a sign that needs to be addressed at 18 N. Penn Street. The sign was installed without HARB approval and needs to be removed. The HARB Consultant indicated that she would present the issue to the City.

3 – Board Elections

Mr. Redshaw nominated Mr. Kunkle as Chair of the HARB Board. The Nomination was seconded by Ms. Landis. No other nominees were presented. The Board voted 5-0 and approved Mr. Kunkle as Chair for 2016.

Mr. Redshaw nominated Ms. Pottorff as Vice Chair. The Nomination was seconded by Mr. Shermeyer. No other nominees were presented. The Board voted 5-0 and approved Ms. Pottorff as Vice-Chair for 2016.

Adjourning and next meeting **The meeting was adjourned at 7:20 pm by general consent; the next scheduled meeting is set for Thursday January 28, 2016.**

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

DRAFT