



**York Historical Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes  
June 28, 2018**

Members in attendance included: Craig Zumbrun (Chair), Dennis Kunkle (Vice-Chair), Dave Redshaw, Theresa Johnescu, Mark Shermeyer,

Absent: Mark Skehan, Rebecca Zeller, Justine Landis, Robyn Pottorff,

Consultant: Lindsey Allen, JMT Senior Architectural Historian / HARB Consultant

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>	<b>ACTION/RESULT</b>
<b>Welcome and call to order</b>	The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm.  The agenda was prepared by the HARB Consultant.	
<b>Changes to the Agenda</b>		
<b>Minutes of June 28, 2018</b>		Mr. Kunkle moved to approve June 28, 2018 minutes. Ms. Johnescu seconded. Approved.
<b>Cases</b>	The following cases are approved with the recommended actions.	

**Case #1 – 50 N. George Street**

**Discussion:**

The applicant is proposing to install a new sign on the front of the building. The proposed sign will be three sided and internally illuminated. It will be installed at the corner of the building at N. George Street and Philadelphia street.

Applicant explained that the name of the company has changed and need to update the sign. The letters are internally illuminated with white LEDs. There’s a decorative element on the top and bottom that are not illuminated – they match details that are on the original marquee.

Mr. Kunkle explained that they heard several months ago about the temporary sign. And at that time he recalled that the sign would not be internally illuminated and asked for explanation.

The applicant explained that at that time they were going to attach a sign to the building but went with this direction where it isn't fixed to the building but it's permanent.

Mr. Shermeyer explained that they are fine with the design but that the sign guideline explicitly prohibits the internally lit signs. Same as the bank –

Applicant clarified that the LEDs are in the sign cabinet but they're not internally lit, but more like a halo. The cabinet itself is opaque and not going to glow – the only illumination is the letters.

**Motion:** Mr. Redshaw moved to approve the application as presented. Ms. Johnescu seconded. Mr. Shermeyer wanted to ensure that the language clarifies that it's the letters, not the cabinet, being lit.

**Additional Discussion:**

**Vote:** 5-0. Motion approved.

**Case #2 – 45 S. Queen Street**

**Discussion:**

The applicant is proposing to repair and replace the roof on the side porch. Due to water damage, the applicant is proposing to replace rotted wood elements in kind and to replace the existing metal roof with asphalt shingles.

If the applicant doesn't know what to use, then Mr. Shermeyer explained that they can recommend a type and color and the consultant can approve.

Applicant identified areas where visible rot is located but that he wouldn't know how much is really going to be replaced until the roof is removed. The standing seam roof is damaged, causing wood damage. He plans to use the same type of shingle he's using on his shed – a standard, three-tab shingle.

The roof isn't really a visible rooftop from public right of way.

**Motion:** Mr. Shermeyer moved to approve the application as presented, that the applicant can use the same shingle that is on the current shed, black in color, and that deteriorated woodwork is in-kind. Mr. Redshaw seconded.

**Additional Discussion:** Mr. Shermeyer explained that there's sealant that can be used to consolidate deteriorated architectural features to salvage them rather than replace. Applicant reiterated that he isn't sure how much needs to be replaced but intends to replace them. If he wants to know more about the product, the consultant can help identify.

**Vote:** 5-0. Motion approved.

**Case #3 – 1 W. Market Street**

**Discussion:**

The applicant is proposing to remove the existing storefront glass at the left side of the existing door and to install a set of double doors.

Mr. Shermeyer recused himself since he is working on the project. The applicants explained that there currently is a narrow storefront in one section of the façade and a door that went to a small storefront next to it – and they’re being combined into one retail space. They need a receiving space, so they want to remove a section of storefront that’s currently used for display, leaving a section of storefront or with original or replacement material that can be exposed to the elements, and then install double glass doors for receiving. The rest of the storefront would be repaired. There’ll be a button for ADA access on the double doors. The single door that provides access to the apartment will remain.

There was preliminary review in September 2017.

Mr. Zumbrun asked if there was a discussion about salvage. Mr. Shermeyer wasn’t sure if anything is authentic as they haven’t started to take apart the façade. It appears that it was once a balanced storefront, and salvage may allow someone in the future to restore the original façade. Mr. Shermeyer explained that there likely isn’t anything unique enough about how it was put together that would warrant salvage.

**Motion:** Mr. Redshaw moved to approve the application as presented, and that the applicant should do their best to salvage architectural components, if possible. Ms. Johnescu seconded.

**Additional Discussion:** None

**Vote:** 4-0. Motion approved.

**Case #4 – 120 N. Howard Street****Discussion:**

The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing building for use as a parking lot.

Mr. Redshaw asked if will be any green space at the site and the applicant indicated no. The applicant explained that the concern is that the building and roof are cracked and that it could cave in. The plan is to pave over the lot. They elaborated that there used to be a dance school in the second floor and that there were asked to leave over concern about the roof. The applicant previously refurbished 135-137 E. Philadelphia Street, next door. The parking lot and the building were part of the purchase. There’s a joint wall to the building behind it and the concern is that if it deteriorates it’ll bring the neighboring building down, too.

Applicant described that the first floor would be removed by hand, then they would bring in a machine to complete the rest. Another contractor will restore the remaining shared wall.

Mr. Shermeyer said that even though it’s listed as contributing, it isn’t significant. The steel windows and modernist appearance is significant. Ms. Johnescu said that the cost outweighs what you’d actually recover from a rehabilitation. Mr. Redshaw said that HARB regulations say they shouldn’t consider financial aspects. Mr. Shermeyer mentioned that it’s on a side alley that’s only partially visible.

Mr. Shermeyer said the front walls are CMU and the side walls are soft brick as they used to be interior walls. Debate ensued about whether the shared wall is integrated or whether they simply abut each other. Conclusion that its probably going to come down to what they find during construction.

**Motion:** Ms. Johnescu moved to approve the application as presented. Mr. Shermeyer seconded with comment that the building, though contributing, isn't that historically significant, is not visible from major thoroughfare, and is very deteriorated.

**Additional Discussion:** Mr. Redshaw requested the applicant add a green space but explained that the HARB Board cannot require it. The applicant noted that they are hesitant because of the potential problems from tree roots. Mr. Redshaw explained that there are trees with deep tap roots that will provide the shade needed in the city and that a landscape architect can identify species for this.

Brief clarification about the architectural significance ensued. It was an early example of modern architecture in 1928, and thus historically significant, but not necessarily considered an architecturally significant feature today.

**Vote:** 5-0. Motion approved.

**Adjourning and next meeting**      **The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 6:50 the next scheduled meeting is set for Thursday July 26, 2018.**

**Minutes recorded by Lindsey Allen, JMT Senior Architectural Historian/HARB Consultant**