



**York Historical Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes  
May 11, 2017**

Members in attendance included W. Craig Zumbrun, Chairperson; Dennis Kunkle; Dave Redshaw; Justine Landis; Rebecca Zeller; John Fox

Absent: Mark Shermeyer; Mark Skehan; Teresa Johnescu; Robyn Pottorff

Consultant: Mary Alfson Tinsman, Architectural Historian/HARB Consultant, JMT

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION/RESULT</b>
<b>Welcome and call to order W. 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>	There were no changes to the agenda.	
<b>Minutes of April 27, 2017</b>		Motion to approve by Ms. Landis, seconded by Mr. Kunkle. Approved
<b>Cases</b>	The following cases are forwarded to York City council with the recommended actions.	

**Case #1 – 100 N. George Street**

The applicant is proposing to replace 89 of the existing 93 windows, to wrap all of the wood sills, and to install lighting. The applicant was represented by Mr. Joe Musso. Mr. Musso presented the application for the property which is at the corner of George Street and Philadelphia Street. The property is currently used for rentals. The property was purchased in the last year and the owner would like to upgrade the facility. The windows have never been replaced – except for four which were previously replaced on the rear of the property. The windows facing Philadelphia and George Street (60 windows) will be replaced with Marvin aluminum clad windows, which have been approved by the HARB Board in the past. Mr. Fox asked if they would be Integrity windows, and the applicant indicated yes. The remaining 30 windows (on the west and north sides) would be vinyl, to help save the cost. The windows will be in the “cashmere” color, similar to what is there.

About half of the window baseboards are currently wrapped, the other half are wood. The actual sills are stone, what will be wrapped are the baseboards. The baseboards are not visible from street level. Rather than tear out and replace all of the wood baseboards they would like to wrap them. Ms. Landis asked what color the wrap would be and the applicant indicated that it would match the proposed windows.

The applicant is also proposing to add lighting to the building, along the first floor to illuminate upwards, similar to on the Pullman building and the Iron Horse. The light will shoot upwards to the cornice. Mr. Zumbrun asked about the size of the lights, and the applicant indicated that they were small lights and would be black. Mr. Zumbrun clarified that the wood clad windows are on Philadelphia and George Streets.

Mr. Musso also noted that there is some concern about the lack of light on the Philadelphia side, and they would like to add gooseneck lights on the south side. As presented the lights would be located on, or near, the masonry band above the first floor. Mr. Fox noted that the lights should be installed into the brick, not the masonry band. Ms. Zeller asked where the lights would go on the smaller three-story building. Mr. Musso indicated they would be on the brick pier or in the wood band. Mr. Fox reinforced that the lights need to be installed into the mortar in the brick section. Mr. Fox also asked if there was a different way to light this side of the building instead of the goosenecks. He asked if the applicant had talked to the City about adding street lights. Mr. Musso stated that the streetlights are approximately \$5,000 each where the cost of the gooseneck lights are much less. Mr. Fox reiterated that he trying to preserve the

A motion was made by Mr. Kunkle to approve the application for the windows as presented, with the exemption being the lights which are being removed from this application and that will be resubmitted as a separate application. The motion was seconded by Ms. Landis.

Additional discussion: Mr. Fox asked about the sills that are going to be wrapped. He asked if they had looked at any other options. The applicant indicated no, since other sills are wrapped on the building and they were going to use the same method for consistency. Mr. Redshaw asked if they could simple replace the wood “sill” or if that was out of the question. Mr. Fox asked how many sills were already wrapped and the applicant indicated approx. 50 of them.

The motion was approved 5-1.

One opposed –Mr. Redshaw will not approve wrapping the wood window sills/baseboards as it does not address the problem with the sills.

## **Case #2 – 252 E. Princess Street**

The applicant proposes to replace five windows on the front façade of the building – two (28x49”) on the third floor and three (28x61”) on the second floor. The windows will be aluminum clad wood windows. Mr. Parker was present to discuss his application. He indicated that his property was inspected and the levels of lead were too high and he needed to replace the windows. He indicated that the windows need to be replaced, not repaired. Mr. Zeller noted that the windows should match the existing divisions which are one-over-one windows. Mr. Redshaw asked about the windows in the alleyway, and the applicant indicated that only the windows on the front are being replaced. The windows are into bedrooms and a bathroom. The work will be completed by someone certified by the EPA for removal of lead paint. The inspector from York Health was in the audience and noted that the windows on the front are not all original windows.

The applicant asked if there was a specific type of window that would be acceptable. Mr. Zumbrun stated that the Board wants a window in kind, keeping the same divisions. Mr. Zumbrun noted that most good manufacturers – such as Anderson, Pella, Marvin - have a high-quality aluminum clad window with a good insulation value. He stated that the reveal of the new windows should be comparable to the existing. Mr. Fox suggested that the applicant look at Integrity by Marvin or the Architectural windows by Pella or Anderson. They will be low-E, thermal pane, double-hung. Mr. Redshaw noted that the windows should be aluminum clad on the exterior and wood on the interior.

Motion by Ms. Zeller to approve the proposal as presented matching the dimensions of the existing windows. The motion was seconded by Ms. Landis.

The motion was approved 6-0.

### **Case #3 – 305 S. George Street**

The applicant is proposing to remove a two-story addition on the rear of the building. The applicant noted that the addition is a two-story vinyl sided structure that is falling apart on the inside. Mr. Zumbrun noted that the addition is not original to the building and it is in poor structural condition. Mr. Kunkle asked how it was attached to the building and the applicant noted that it will be re-bricked and re-pointed. No window openings need to be filled, just the door openings. The doorways that will be bricked in are not significant in any way.

Mr. Kunkle asked what will be there when the addition is demolished. The applicant indicated it will be concrete as a parking spot for the priests.

Motion by Mr. Redshaw to approve as presented was seconded by Mr. Kunkle.

The motion was approved 6-0.

### **Case #4 – 309-311 W. Market Street**

Mr. Fox is recusing himself from this application as he is presenting for the applicant.

The applicant is proposing to replace six windows on the east side of the building. The application was presented by Lynn Nelson and Mr. John Fox. They are replacing six windows that are visible from the street. They will be aluminum clad wood Marvin Integrity windows and will be one-over-one windows. Mr. Zumbrun asked if the windows had a standard size and reveal.

Motion by Mr. Redshaw to approve as presented was seconded by Ms. Landis.

The motion was approved 6-0.

### **Case #5 – 371 W. King Street**

The applicant is proposing to remove the existing shingles and to replace them with new Timberline pewter gray shingles. The applicant was represented by the contractor. The existing shingles are a combination of asphalt shingles and rubber roofing that is wrapped over the peak of the roof. Mr. Redshaw asked if the new shingles would be architectural shingles and the applicant indicated that they are architectural shingles. Mr. Redshaw asked what the rest of the area houses had, and the applicant indicated that they were a variety of materials. Mr. Fox asked if the flashing would be replaced, and the

applicant indicated yes. He clarified the color and type of shingles would be Timberline architectural pewter gray shingles.

[The HARB Consultant will email the Board additional photographs of the property.]

Motion by Ms. Landis to approve as presented was seconded by Ms. Zeller.

The motion was approved 4-0.

Opposed: Mr. Redshaw opposed the application due to the lack of supporting documentation and information presented. Additional photographs and information are necessary to make a determination.

Abstained: Mr. Fox as he required additional information from the HARB consultant.

### **Case #6 – 479 W. King Street**

The applicant was not present. The case is tabled.

The motion was approved 6-0.

### **Case #7 – 206 E. Market Street**

The applicant is proposing to construct new stairs and a landing on the rear of the building. The applicant was present (Mr. Yorni LaRosa). He indicated that they purchased the property a few months ago, and they wanted to add a second access (the only rear access is to the kitchen). The applicant began construction and was issued a stop work order as they did not have a permit. Mr. Zumbrun asked what materials were being used and the applicant indicated it was standard dimensional pressure treated lumber. The railing will match the existing as closely as possible. Ms. Zeller noted that the balcony/stairs are barely visible. The applicant noted that the balcony is more visible. Mr. Zumbrun asked what the balcony was constructed out of, and the applicant indicated it was wood.

Mr. Kunkle clarified that there are two sets of stairs separated by a landing. Mr. Redshaw asked about the railing, and the applicant indicated they were going to try to match the existing railing and balustrade as closely as possible. Mr. Fox clarified that the railing would pressure treated like the existing railing. He noted that you can paint the pressure treated wood after six-months.

Motion by Mr. Kunkle to approve as presented, matching the color and style of the existing railing as closely as possible to the existing, was seconded by Ms. Zeller.

The motion was approved 6-0.

**Adjourning and next meeting      The meeting was adjourned  
by general consent at 7:15.**

**Other business                                      None.**

**Minutes recorded by Mary Alfson Tinsman, Architectural Historian/HARB Consultant, JMT.**