



**York Historical Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes  
April 13, 2017**

Members in attendance included: Craig Zumbrun, Chair; Mark Shermeyer; Mark Skehan; Dennis Kunkle (Vice-Chair); Robin Pottorff (at 6:05)

Absent: Teresa Johnescu; Rebecca Zeller; John Fox; Justine Landis; Dave Redshaw

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

City of York: Nicole Gallup, Planner, City of York City

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION/RESULT</b>
<b>Welcome and call to order Craig Zumbrun, 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>		None.
<b>Minutes of March 23, 2017</b>		Move to approve by Mr. Shermeyer, seconded by Mr. Kunkle. Approved.
<b>Cases</b>	The following cases are approved with the recommended actions.	

**Case #1 – 605 S George Street**

A request from Eric W. Jones for the construction of a concrete ramp and walkway in the rear of the property leading to S. George Street. The new use of a portion of the space is causing an egress issue with the access to the building. The only option to add an additional entrance was at the rear of the building. The project will add a door and a ramp; the easiest option is to run the ramp towards George Street. The proposed pad will be 7 ½ feet by 6 ½ feet with the ramp leading from the pad. There is a black iron fence that runs off the building. The fence will be moved, but retained. The gate on the fence will be moved to allow for the access to the door/ramp. The ramp will have galvanized railing, per code.

Motion: Mr. Shermeyer made a motion to approve as submitted as the building is a modern non-contributing building. Mr. Kunkle seconded.

Additional Discussion: None

The motion was approved 4 to 0.

### **Case #2 –50 N George Street**

A request from Todd Fogdall, for new signage and lighting to be installed at the exterior of the Strand-Capitol Theater building as they re-brand to the Appel Center for the Performing Arts. Mr. Fogdall explained that they are renaming their facility to the Appell Center for the Performing Arts. They are planning to replace the sign at the box office with a new sign the same size using the existing sign bracket. Along the Philadelphia Street side, they are replacing the existing sign in kind, also using the existing sign bracket.

The applicant is also planning to put up two large banners directly onto the wall of the building – without drilling or anchoring into the brick. The signs would be adhered to the building with an adhesive directly onto the surface of the building. The adhesive is removable from the building surface without damaging the materials. This is temporary branding to highlight the new branding for the community. They are planning to retain the temporary banners for 6-12 months.

Mr. Zumbrun asked about the light fixtures that are illustrated in the renderings provided. The applicant explained that near the box office there is limited lighting, and it is hard to see the box office sign. They would like to install two lights to illuminate the sign and to provide ambient lighting in the area to improve safety. They are looking at a fixture that would have two lights on the same fixture- one focused on the sign and one on the entrance. Mr. Kunkle asked if the lights were being installed on the wood door surround or into the brick? Mr. Fogdall was not sure if the depiction was accurate and would like to follow up with the board on the location/installation of the lights.

Mr. Zumbrun noted that an ongoing discussion for the Board with applicants is appropriate lighting for the Historic District. He noted that the lights presented are very modern (the size/shape/configuration) and they are not respectful of the building and the Historic District. Ms. Pottorff noted that the light fixtures seem very large. Mr. Zumbrun asked if the applicant had a lighting expert review the lights and the location. Mr. Shermeyer noted that the light on the door surround would be the most disruptive, the other would not be as visible. Ms. Pottorff asked if there was a way to better hide the proposed lights using smaller fixtures to be more appropriate. Mr. Zumbrun reinforced this idea using two different fixtures – one to illuminate the sign and one for the door.

Mr. Shermeyer asked what the size of the proposed banner signs would be and the applicant indicated that they would be 96x96 inches. The signs will be on the blank area of the walls as presented and will not remain longer than a year. Ms. Gallup clarified that a temporary sign permit is 90-days and would need to be renewed every 90-days. There is no plan for larger, new, permanent signs on the building. Ms. Gallup also noted that the size of the sign may also be an issue. Mr. Skehan asked if they had considered projecting an image onto the wall as opposed to installing a sign. Mr. Fogdall indicated that they had considered this, but not extensively, as the projection would not be visible during the day.

Motion: Ms. Pottorff made a motion to approve the application for the signs as presented (both permanent and temporary). The application for the two light fixtures is tabled and will be brought back to the Board for additional discussion after further research by the applicant. Mr. Shermeyer seconded the motion and noted that the Board is approving the two permanent signs and the two temporary signs, which will remain no more than 12-months from the date of installation.

Additional Discussion:

The motion was approved 5 to 0.

### **Case #3 – 1 W. Market Street**

A request from I-Ron-IC for the installation of a canvas awning and the installation of a service counter at the front of the property. The applicant explained that there was previously an awning on site and they would like to replace it with a new awning. They would also like to create a wood bar on the exterior. They would also like to add a service window (a take-out window) within the existing window opening. The bar would be 9-inches deep. The support for the bar would be industrial pipe. Underneath the bar would be black vinyl (to block the window) to obscure the view into the interior. This is for the last bay on the Market Street side. Mr. Zumbrun clarified that there will be no interior customer area and the applicant concurred.

Motion: Mr. Shermeyer made a motion to approve as presented. Ms. Pottorff seconded the motion.

Additional Discussion: None.

The motion was approved 5 to 0.

### **Case #4 – 218 Liberty Court**

Holly DeKarske presented for the City. The building is on the corner of Susquehanna and Liberty Court. The building is poor shape and it is difficult to keep crime and drugs out of the building. The building was originally two buildings that have been converted into one. The rear of the property is a dumping ground for trash. There is an interest in the future use of the space for additional parking.

Motion: Mr. Shermeyer made a motion to approve as presented due to the extreme deterioration of the property. The building does not retain its historic fabric or integrity. Mr. Kunkle seconded.

Additional Discussion: None.

The motion was approved 5 to 0.

### **Case #5 – 353 S. George Street**

Holly DeKarske presented for the City. The building is not attached to the neighboring building. While the building has good architecture, the building is an eminent safety hazard. Ms. DeKarske is planning to invite ReSource to salvage elements of the building as appropriate and safe.

Motion: Mr. Kunkle made a motion to approve as presented due to the extreme deterioration of the property. Mr. Shermeyer seconded. While a contributing resource to the Historic District, the condition of the building is beyond salvage. The historic door hood and transom may be salvaged if possible.

Additional Discussion: None.

The motion was approved 5 to 0.

## **Case #6 – 632 S. Queen Street**

Holly DeKarske presented for the City. The building is in extremely poor condition. It is attached to the neighboring homes and is causing damage to the neighboring homes. Mr. Shermeyer asked how the adjacent buildings would be treated and Ms. DeKarske noted that they would be stuccoed on the exterior. The City is obtaining engineering plans for how to maintain the neighboring buildings during and after demolition.

Motion: Mr. Shermeyer made a motion to approve as presented. While a contributing building in the Historic District it is extremely deteriorated. The adjacent party walls will be reconstructed and stuccoed as appropriate. Ms. Pottorff seconded.

Additional Discussion:

The motion was approved 5 to 0.

Additional Discussion: Mr. Kunkle asked Ms. DeKarske if she could explain for the Board's newer members how the buildings reached these conditions. She explained that these were all acquired through eminent domain due to blight. She explained that prior to the City owning the properties the property owners were cited and fined and did not make the necessary changes.

### **Other business:**

Mr. Skehan asked about 620 S. Queen and it being a contributing element of the historic district. Mr. Kunkle explained that it is contributing due to its age, its location, and as one element of the streetscape, which also contributes to the historic district. The building is also little altered, despite its deterioration.

**Adjourning and next meeting**      **The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 6:35pm; the next scheduled meeting is set for Thursday April 27, 2017.**

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