



**York Historical Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes
September 24, 2015**

Members in attendance included: Dennis Kunkle, Vice Chair; Justine Landis; Dave Redshaw; Robin Pottorff; W. Craig Zumbrun

Absent: John Fox, Chair; Matt Argabright; Teresa Johnescu; Mark Shermeyer

Consultant: Christine Leggio, Architectural Historian/ 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 HARB Consultant.	A quorum was present.
Changes to the Agenda		
Minutes of September 10, 2015		Move to approve by Dave Redshaw; seconded by Ms. Landis. Approved.
Cases	The following cases are approved as presented.	

Case #1 – 59 E. Market Street

A request by Murphy & Dittenhafer Architects for the construction of a two-story, zinc panel clad elevator shaft on the property at 59 E Market Street. The exterior of the elevator shaft will be partially visible on the exterior of the building from North Duke Street. The existing door in the portico, behind which the shaft will be installed, will be moved to the adjacent wall and the opening will be infilled with brick to match the existing. Additionally, the existing masonry will be cleaned and repointed, glazing will be replaced in damaged windows, and the existing low-slope membrane roofs will be replaced in-kin while the historic metal roof will remain unaltered. The scope of work also includes the repainting of some exterior elements.

The applicants, Frank Dittenhafer and Ryan Shank, stated that the building is the former Lafayette Club, which is being purchased by York College. The building was constructed by Phillip Small in 1839 and it has had multiple additions spanning through the early 1970s. York College intends to conduct a phased renovation over several years.

Ms. Landis asked what the use of the building will be, and Mr. Dittenhafer stated that the building will be used for the College's Hospitality Management Program, as well as their Center for Community Engagement. The building will also include classrooms, and apartments for visiting Fellows on the top floors. Mr. Dittenhafer explained that, while there will be some interior alterations, particularly for reasons of accessibility, the College will be using a "light hand" in the renovation and seeks to alter as little historic fabric as possible. The applicants stated that both interior and exterior renovations will be minimal. Some portions of the roof will be replaced because they are in poor condition and active leaking is causing damage to some of the plaster walls and some windows. The applicants stated that damaged windows will be repaired rather than replaced, and that some minor repointing of some exterior areas will occur. They also stated that signage will be added to the exterior of the building, but that work will be reviewed under a future HARB application.

Mr. Dittenhafer emphasized that York College is interested in preserving aspects of the building's history as the Lafayette Club, including keeping stained glass and carpeting with Lafayette Club insignias, and preserving the grand stairway. He stated that York College's primary criteria for any building is ADA accessibility and that the elevator is necessary to that end. Its location was chosen to create the least possible disturbance of interior historic fabric.

Mr. Dittenhafer stated that they found room to fit the elevator behind an existing wall near the alcove on the Duke Street entryway. The elevator will provide access to lower levels as well as the 2nd and 3rd floors from the Duke Street sidewalk level, thus providing ADA access to 5 levels of the building. The relocation of the entryway will allow space for an entryway with access to the existing stairs and proposed the elevator.

Mr. Redshaw asked whether the existing portico is open to the outside. Mr. Shank stated that it is. Mr. Redshaw asked whether the elevator would be accessible from the exterior alcove area or if its users would have to enter the building to access it.

Mr. Dittenhafer stated that elevator will be on the interior, while the alcove will remain open to the street. He clarified that the existing door will be relocated to the adjacent wall. He stated that some existing metal plaques will also be relocated within the entryway. Mr. Shank stated that the brick infill for the door area will match the existing brick.

Mr. Redshaw asked whether the existing historic door would be moved in its entirety (including sidelights, transom, pediment, architrave, etc.). The applicants stated that it would, and Mr. Redshaw stated that it would now be visible from Duke Street.

Mr. Redshaw asked whether tax credits were involved in the project. Mr. Dittenhafer stated that they are not. The applicants went on to explain that only the upper two levels of the elevator shaft will be visible, and only from Duke Street.

Mr. Kunkle asked how it was possible that the elevator did not go higher than the 5th story of the building. Mr. Dittenhafer explained that it does in-fact go higher, but that an attic area above the 5th floor hides the mechanism.

Mr. Kunkle asked what the proposed material for the exterior cladding will be. Mr. Dittenhafer stated that it will be pre-patinated zinc. Mr. Kunkle stated that it looks white in the renderings, and Mr. Dittenhafer stated that there are two finish choices – one that is silver in appearance and a darker, pre-patinated finish. Mr. Redshaw asked which finish they have chosen, and Mr. Dittenhafer stated that they have chosen the darker finish, which is charcoal gray or pewter-like in color. Mr. Redshaw asked

whether the cladding will be held together with clips. Mr. Dittenhafer said yes and stated that the tower will be a stick-built tower, which will diminish the footprint and minimize the size of the tower.

Mr. Zumburn commended the College on the sensitivity of the design.

Motion: A motion was made by Mr. Zumburn, seconded by Ms. Landis, to approve the application as presented.

Additional discussion: Mr. Kunkle noted the other work in the application, including window repairs, masonry cleaning, and repainting, and asked whether the work will be done according to the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Mr. Dittenhafer stated that it would.

Motion: The Motion was approved 5 to 0.

Adjourning and next meeting **A motion to adjourn the meeting was made by Mr. Zumburn and seconded by Ms. Pottorff. The meeting adjourned at 6:30 pm. The next meeting is scheduled for Thursday October 8, 2015.**

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