



York Historical Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes
March 23, 2017

Members in attendance included: Craig Zumbun, Chair; Mark Shermeyer; Mark Skehan (left at 7:40); Dennis Kunkle (Vice-Chair); Rebecca Zeller; John Fox; Justine Landis; Dave Redshaw; Robin Pottorff

Absent: Teresa Johnescu

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

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION/RESULT
Welcome and call to order Craig Zumbun, 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		None.
Minutes of March 9, 2017		Move to approve by Ms. Landis, seconded by Mr. Shermeyer. Approved.
Cases	The following cases are approved with the recommended actions.	

Case #1 – 355-357-359 W. Philadelphia Street

A request from Matthew Wonders for the rehabilitation of the property after a recent fire. This work would include the replacement of ten windows, a section of the slate shingles, the front entry door at 359 W. Philadelphia Street, and the replacement of the aluminum soffit and gutter.

The proposed windows will be aluminum clad wood windows. Mr. Shermeyer clarified that the windows will be one-over-one and the window openings will not be changing. The storefront window will be retained. The only first floor change is the door at 359 W. Philadelphia Street. The current door is a wood door that was damaged in the fire.

Mr. Redshaw asked if the applicant had looked at ReStore for a replacement door, and the applicant indicated no. Mr. Shermeyer would like to see if the door can be repaired rather than replaced. Mr. Redshaw questioned how critical it was since it is the only historic door in the row. Mr. Zumbun noted

that when it is possible to salvage a historic element of a building the Board prefers that the attempt be made to restore the door rather than replace. The damage is near the lock set, and Mr. Shermeyer indicated it can likely be fixed, Mr. Fox concurred.

Mr. Redshaw asked what section of the roof would be replaced. The applicant indicated that they are going to repair the roof and use in-kind slate shingles.

Regarding the gutter, Mr. Redshaw recommend that the applicant look at half-round gutters if possible.

Mr. Shermeyer made a motion to approve the application as presented, with the following additions: All the windows will be replaced with metal clad wood one-over-one windows fitting the existing openings, the slate will be replaced in-kind, the aluminum work will be done in kind, the gutter will be replaced in kind or with a half-round gutter, and the door at 359 W. Philadelphia Street will be repaired rather than replaced. Any existing architectural features existing on the buildings will not be altered/changed. Mr. Redshaw seconded the motion.

Additional discussion: Mr. Redshaw noted that the cornice at 359 is original and in good shape, and the applicant noted that they are not replacing it.

The motion was approved 9 to 0.

Case #2 – 33 S. Duke Street

A request from Murphy & Dittenhafer Architects, on behalf of CBY Systems, for the addition of a new handicap ramp, new storefront entrance, new windows, and exterior painting. The property is a non-contributing building located within the historic district. The building is not currently ADA compliant and it requires the addition of a new ramp and handrail to be compliant. The existing stair will be removed and a new ramp and rail will be constructed. The existing doorway will be removed, and a single door with sidelight will be added. The proposal is also to remove the existing windows and to install a modern storefront to provide more light to the interior. The existing brick planter will be retained.

Mr. Redshaw clarified that the ramp will be constructed in front of the brick planter and asked if it will encroach into the existing sidewalk. Mr. Redshaw noted that the applicant should check with the zoning officer. Mr. Shermeyer noted that there might be enough sidewalk to construct the ramp while retaining the sidewalk clearance.

Mr. Zumbrun clarified the storefront, which will be two separate openings. The window width will not be changed however the vertical length will be increased. Mr. Fox asked why the two proposed windows will be different heights? The applicant noted that the owner liked the rhythm of the varied opening sizes. Mr. Shermeyer noted that as a non-contributing building this doesn't matter, which Mr. Fox concurred with.

Mr. Redshaw asked why they were painting the brick. The applicant noted it was just the column and the brick planter. Mr. Shermeyer noted that there are two types of brick that don't match. The column matches the building and the planter is a different type of brick. Mr. Shermeyer noted that because the building is mismatched now that the painting would be okay with him. Mr. Redshaw noted that maintenance might be an issue.

Mr. Redshaw made a motion to approve the application as presented. Ms. Landis seconded the motion.

Additional discussion:

The motion was approved 9 to 0.

Case #3 – 48 E. Market Street

A request from the York County Industrial Development Authority (YCIDA) for a preliminary discussion regarding the Yorktowne Hotel. Blanda Nace presented for the YCIDA.

In 2015 YCIDA became aware that the hotel was for sale, and worked with the broker who was selling the property. Through an evaluation of the potential buyers, the YCIDA elected to secure funding to purchase the building and continued to operate it as a hotel until Nov. 6, 2016, when the hotel was closed for renovations. They were losing money every month on operations, so YCIDA elected to close the building to stem the loses. YCIDA hired an architect for the design. YCIDA also noted that they have hired a construction manager to provide cost estimates during the design process. They are also interviewing operators so that they can be involved with the planning. They would like a large hotel chain to appeal to business travelers.

The project is being presented in phases.

Mr. Nace would like to obtain approval for partial demolition if possible, however tonight's presentation is to gain general Board input into the project. Mr. Nace handed out a presentation to the Board for review. The presentation included a history of the building with historic photos. YCIDA wants to maintain and restore the historic components of the building while adapting it to modern use. There is a 1929 and a 1957 addition. The majority of the 1957 addition has been closed for years and was just used as storage. There are exterior issues with cracks, missing mortar, etc. and in the 1957 addition there is spalling, rotted/broken concrete, and rusted steel.

The interior features many issues, including legacy utilities. One concept that has been discussed involves the size of the rooms with the existing columns and slabs. They are currently looking at seismic retrofits, how to resize the spaces, elevator lifts issues, exit stair issues, doors that open in the wrong direction, etc.... The goal is to balance these upgrades with the restoration work that they would like to do. On the exterior of the building, they are researching what was historically part of the building and what the footprint of the building was.

The plan for the building is state of the art, destination restaurant, spa, parking, etc. Parking is critical. They are also looking at restaurant space, offices, living space, the overall hotel program, etc. They would like the building to be a community space for public use as well – Mr. Nace noted that the hotel was constructed with public donations originally. They are exploring conference center facilities and those needs. They would like to activate the street with inside-outside windows and would also like to include a rooftop bar/terrace.

Phase 2 – Zion Lutheran Church

The applicant also owns the Zion Lutheran Church. The building is 230,000 square feet that is divided and unorganized. The issues encountered are the same as with the hotel, and the biggest issue is to determine how to fit a modern hotel room into the irregularly shaped building. By shifting the

orientation of the rooms, they believe that they can work within the existing column spacing. The ceiling heights are acceptable, and there will be space for utilities, sprinklers, etc. Challenges remain, including insulation, what the wall construction is, working with energy efficiency codes, etc. One concept also includes residential space as an option and is that a possibility for the space (i.e. sell a floor to a developer for apartments/condos).

In terms of parking, one option is a parking garage behind the Church off Duke Street. Another option involves a circular drop-off with a canopy on the back as the new main entrance, with a park-like setting, with a walkway to the parking garage. The goal is to create a parklike setting. A third option involves shortening the garage, which eliminates the need to demolish adjacent residential properties, and still create a plaza setting. This phase is still undergoing changes/planning options.

Exterior repairs/alterations are still being explored, but may include infill brick, new staircase/elevator access, repointing, etc. They do not want to reproduce history, but want something sympathetic and appropriate.

Mr. Kunkle asked what the capacity will be when done. The applicant indicated it will be between 100-120 rooms. The typical costs for a chain hotel are approximately \$120,000 per room for “greenspace” construction (ground up). Mr. Nace noted that they are aware that they will have unexpected expenses due to the historic nature of the building.

Mr. Redshaw asked for clarification on the proposed demolition. Mr. Nace noted that it is the 1957 addition including the parking.

Mr. Nace handed out photos associated with the Church portion of the project. Mr. Redshaw asked if there were graves on site, and the applicant noted that they have not explored that yet as it requires a court order. There are significant interior issues that Mr. Nace outlined. Mr. Nace noted that there are interior features that they would like to retain, such as the divider wall in the lower level. The building has been secured, however there is still an issue of break-ins. They would like to demolish the 1941 addition which houses the former gymnasium. There are also exterior concerns.

Overall, the applicant would like to demolish the 1941 addition on the church, keep the main sanctuary and repurpose it, and redo the mechanical systems. They would also like to demolish the 1957 addition and parking garage addition on the hotel.

Mr. Zumbrun summarized the presentation as it relates to the proposed demolitions. Mr. Nace indicated that yes, they would like the Board to approve the demolition with a caveat that the applicant would return to the Board with any proposed changes / alterations to the plans and concept design. Mr. Zumbrun asked if the church property would have the necessary space to support an event space (i.e. cleaning, cooking). His question was if the demolition of the additions in their entirety is necessary or if some of it can be repurposed. Mr. Nace noted that they have looked at potential use of the addition and have determined that there is no possibility for reuse.

Mr. Zumbrun again summarized the proposed demolitions including those on the church and the hotel. Mr. Zumbrun noted that he has no issues with what is proposed. Mr. Shermeyer concurred. Mr. Fox noted his concern was the historic church core and that he was satisfied with the proposed plan for the building. Mr. Fox noted that it is important to maintain the city-scape and streetscape views of the property and the surrounding area.

Mr. Shermeyer noted that the Hotel made Preservation Pennsylvania's List of most endangered buildings in Pennsylvania for 2017. Mr. Nace noted that they are fine with their place on the list and felt that it helped bring awareness to the project.

Mr. Zumbrun made a motion to approve the application for the demolition of the Zion Lutheran Church 1947 addition and the 1957 addition to the Yorktowne Hotel – including the parking structure - with the strong endorsement for the reuse and retention of the remaining historic fabric. This will allow the historic church and hotel to be preserved in perpetuity. All other exterior renovations and alterations will be brought to the board. Ms. Landis seconded the motion.

Additional discussion:

The motion was approved 9 to 0.

Other business:

Adjourning and next meeting **The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 7:25pm; the next scheduled meeting is set for Thursday April 13, 2017.**

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