



**York Historical Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes  
September 14, 2017**

Members in attendance included W. Craig Zumbrun, Chairperson; Dennis Kunkle; Mark Shermeyer; Mark Skehan; Robin Pottorff

Absent: Justine Landis; Teresa Johnescu; Dave Redshaw; Becky Zeller

Consultant: Christine Leggio, 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 was one addition to the agenda: by common consent, the preliminary review of proposed alterations to the storefront at 11 W Market Street.	The item was added to the agenda as Case #3. No motion was made but the Board indicated that the proposed alteration is reasonable and can be approved pending the Board's review of the particular configuration and finishes.
<b>Minutes of August 10, 2017</b>	Motion to approve by Mark Shermeyer, seconded by Dennis Kunkle.	The minutes from the meeting held August 10, 2017 were approved with no changes.
<b>Cases</b>	The following cases are forwarded to York City council with the recommended actions.	

**Case #1 – 29 S Duke Street**

The applicant is proposing to replace 20 existing wood double hung windows at the second floor of the property at 29 S Duke Street with new, Marvin aluminum clad windows, as well as to replace an existing rooftop air condenser with two new air condensers.

**Minutes:** The applicant apologized for the confusion regarding the installation of the proposed items prior to HARB approval. He stated that they had approval for the first-floor window replacements.

He noted that the second-floor windows match those on the first floor and that the rooftop condensers were upgraded and serve the second floor. Two furnaces are located on the third floor at the interior of the property.

Mr. Shermeyer motioned to approve the application as submitted and Mr. Kunkle seconded. The motion was carried with all in favor.

### **Case #2 – 301 W Market Street**

The applicant is proposing to alter the existing entryway on the property at 301 W Market Street by adding a cast concrete landing, stained to match the existing granite steps, with granite treads, to rehabilitate the entryway and meet code requirements.

**Minutes:** Seth Wentz is the architect of record for the project and is representing the proposed project. He stated that upon removal of the concrete block infill from the front entryway, it was discovered that an approximately 16-inch separation exists between the top of the original stoop and the interior of the building. Three risers are needed to fill the gap and meet code.

The interior floor is cast-in-place concrete.

The proposed solution is to add a concrete landing at the front entry. Two columns flanking the front door were omitted from the originally submitted plan of the proposed alteration. The proposed alteration will fit around the existing columns.

Granite to match the existing granite of the steps will be applied to the treads and risers.

Mr. Shermeyer motioned to approve the application (as per the amended drawing), and Mr. Kunkle seconded. The motion was carried with all in favor.

### **Case #3 – 11 W Market Street**

The applicant is proposing to alter the existing entryway on the property at 301 W Market Street by adding a cast concrete landing, stained to match the existing granite steps, with granite treads, to rehabilitate the entryway and meet code requirements.

**Minutes:** The potential tenant for the property at 11 W Market is looking to remove the existing storefront glass (on the left side of the existing door) in order to install a set of double doors to receive deliveries through the Market Street entrance. The potential tenant has requested that the applicant get preliminary approval on the alteration before they will agree to lease the space.

Mr. Shermeyer and Ms. Pottroff noted that the existing storefront is asymmetrical.

Mr. Kunkle asked what the previous use of the space was, and the applicant indicated that there is a mobile phone retailer in one portion of the space, while the previous tenant in the other half was previously a sneaker retailer.

Ms. Pottroff noted that the full space includes a double door and if the applicant's tenant is going to utilize the full space, why could they not use the double doors on the other storefront? Mr. Skehan asked whether the rear alley could be used for deliveries.

