



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

Members in attendance included: Mark Shermeyer chairing, Teresa Johnescu; Mark Skehan, Dave Redshaw; Robin Pottorff, Craig Zumbrun, Chair (6:12pm)

Absent: Justine Landis, Dennis Kunkle (Vice-Chair), Rebecca Zeller;

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

| AGENDA ITEM | DISCUSSION | ACTION/RESULT |
|---|--|--|
| Welcome and call to order Mark Shermeyer, Acting Chair | The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm. The agenda was prepared by the HARB Consultant. | A quorum was present. Mr. Shermeyer served as acting Chair as the Chair and Vice-Chair were not present. |
| Changes to the Agenda | | None. |
| Minutes of November 9, 2017 | | Move to approve the November 9th meeting minutes by Mr. Johnescu; Ms. Pottorff seconded. Passed. |
| Cases | The following cases are approved with the recommended actions. | |

Case #1 – 330 S. George Street

A request for the replacement of the roof on the property. The owner was not present so the application as tabled.

Case #2 – 37 N. Newberry Street

A request for the repair of a soffit and fascia on the façade of the property. The fascia and soffit are rotted, and the gutter has pulled away from the home. Mr. Redshaw clarified that the wood would be replaced in kind, and the owner indicated that only wood would be used – no aluminum. The applicant had their contractor explain the roofing/rot issue that they are seeing. The owner clarified that each building has an individual end cap. Mr. Redshaw clarified that the gutter comes down into the joined downspout for the property and the neighboring property's and the applicant indicated yes. Mr. Redshaw asked if the

downspout would be painted and the applicant indicated yes. The board noted that the galvanized steel would need to be treated with vinegar prior to painting.

Mr. Redshaw moved to approved. Mr. Skehan seconded. Motion passed 5-0.

Case #3 - 315 W. Princess Street

The applicant is proposing to remove the existing second-store balcony on the property and infill the second story access door with brick. The applicant, Thomas Warner, presented his application. He explained that in 2014 he obtained a permit and HARB approval to repair the balcony, however the work was not completed due to the requirements for the work. Mr. Warner indicated that the added value of the balcony would not provide him with the return he would want should he sell the property in the future. He does not feel that there is any inherent aesthetic value to the balcony and he would prefer to remove the balcony without replacement. He feels that to complete the work in a satisfactory manner would require a tie in to the second-floor joists which would involve extensive work. He is also concerned that the contractors in the area would not be familiar with this type of work. His preference is to remove the balcony and to fill in the entrance with brick that would match the existing brick.

Mr. Redshaw asked for clarification of how the balcony and the roof tied together. Mr. Redshaw noted that the balcony is part of the rear ell of the building. The applicant indicated he felt that the balcony could be removed without affecting the integrity of the roof of the ell. Mr. Redshaw asked what had happened to the portions of the railing that are missing the pickets. The applicant indicated that the railing was repaired due to being cited by the City. The applicant indicated that there were originally balusters that had been replaced.

Ms. Pottorff noted that she disagrees with the applicant's statement regarding the value of the balcony – the balcony is desirable and valuable to the property. As a realtor she has seen this type of balcony add value to buildings. Mr. Shermeyer noted that any residential contractor would be able to provide the repairs needed. He further noted that he agreed that the balcony is integral to the house. Mr. Redshaw agreed that it is not difficult to have these repairs made.

Mr. Redshaw noted that the floor joists of the deck likely extend into or through the brick. Mr. Shermeyer noted that there is an outstanding permit and HARB approval for repair of the balcony. He does not see that the Board would reverse this opinion. The building is highly visible.

Ms. Johnescu asked what happened to the original pickets. The applicant did not answer.

The applicant again indicated that the construction method needed was expensive and difficult. Mr. Shermeyer noted that the applicants understanding of what may be necessary is not what may be required. If the balcony was tied to the building with a ledger board then the strong tie method would perhaps be required. Mr. Redshaw noted that the roof is still a potential concern. The applicant restated that he doesn't see an issue with putting in a post to support the roof of the ell. Mr. Shermeyer noted that the permit office would likely require a structural engineer to design the post system for the roof support due to the size and height of the roof. Ms. Pottorff noted that the balcony deck provides the necessary support that would not be present with a single post.

Mr. Skehan noted that the benefit of having the joists into the brick wall is a benefit to the structural stability of the balcony. Mr. Shermeyer asked if the joists supporting the deck are sound and the applicant indicated that they are rotten. Mr. Redshaw asked why the first-floor posts are not in line with the second-floor posts, nothing that they appear to be replacements.

Mr. Redshaw moved to deny the application. Ms. Johnescu seconded.

Additional Discussion: The applicant asked if a free-standing deck would be considered by the Board. Mr. Shermeyer noted that as long as the new free-standing deck had the same appearance the board would consider it. Mr. Redshaw again asked where the original balusters were. The applicant indicated he had some of them and Mr. Redshaw noted that a good wood shop can recreate them. In terms of a new deck, Mr. Shermeyer noted that if the permit office approved a new deck that the Board would review it again.

Ms. Johnescu noted that the Board would need to see plans for a new deck with details on materials and appearance. Ms. Pottorff noted that it would be more expensive to remove the deck and fix the roof and that it would be less costly to repair the deck. She noted that the deck is a significant feature both historically and from a selling point. The board asked what the underside of the deck looked like from the first floor – the applicant indicated it was finished wood bead-board. Mr. Redshaw noted that bead-board may not be required as the replacement material that the board would consider a similar material that is less costly.

Ms. Johnescu stated that the board should vote on the application and then the applicant could reapply with plans for the repair/replacement of the existing balcony.

The applicant asked if the Board would consider approving something other than the existing balusters. Ms. Johnescu noted that no, the original pickets should be reused/replaced. The applicant asked about iron railings and Mr. Shermeyer indicated that no, iron would not be acceptable as it is not historically accurate. Ms. Johnescu noted that the goal was to preserve the architectural features and style of the building. She further indicated that the least costly option would be to reuse the original pickets.

The motion to deny was restated, with an option to resubmit with plans to reconstruct if the applicant chooses to do so.

Motion to deny was passed 6-0

Case #4 – 267-269 E. Market Street

The applicant is proposing the installation of two new railings to the front steps of the building. Ms. Maugham presented the application and explained that they have tenants and are a business and the existing stairs are slick and can be dangerous. Mr. Redshaw noted that other buildings in the area have wrought iron, not aluminum railings. Mr. Shermeyer noted that an appropriate profile might be appropriate in aluminum. Mr. Shermeyer noted that it would not be more expensive to use wrought iron than aluminum. He noted that the Board would need to see a plan for how the railings would be run and would need to see the materials/style/color of the proposed railings. Ms. Johnescu would like to table the application. Mr. Skehan noted that they have a template they can follow in the upper railing, in a more simplistic format. Mr. Shermeyer concurred.

The applicant indicated that she would work with their contractor to provide additional information for the Board. Mr. Skehan noted that ReStore York might be an option for materials or Refindings.

Ms. Johnescu moved to table. Mr. Redshaw seconded; motion passed 6-0

Case #1 – 330 S. George Street

The owner of the property was not present, however Mr. Shermeyer requested the Board review the application with the information provided in the HARB application.

Mr. Redshaw moved to approve the application with the following requirements; The shingles must be replaced in kind; the front gutter will be lined with EPDM; the side gutter on the rear will be replaced with 5-inch half round and three-inch round downspouts. If the dormer cheeks are disturbed they should be shingled to match existing. Ms. Johnescu seconded. Motion passed 6-0

Other business:

Adjourning and next meeting **The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 6:50; the next scheduled meeting is set for Thursday January 11, 2018.**

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