



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

Members in attendance included: Craig Zumbun (Chair), Dennis Kunkle (Vice-Chair), Mark Skehan, Dave Redshaw, Mark Shermeyer, Rebecca Zeller

Absent: Justine Landis, Robyn Pottorff, Teresa Johnescu

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

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION/RESULT
Welcome and call to order	The meeting was called to order at 6:00 pm. The agenda was prepared by the HARB Consultant.	
Changes to the Agenda		
Minutes of June 14, 2018		Mr. Kunkle moved to approve May 24, 2018 minutes. Mr. Skehan seconded. Approved.
Cases	The following cases are approved with the recommended actions.	

Case #1 – 125 E. Philadelphia Street

Discussion:

The applicant is proposing to replace the existing standing seam metal roof with architectural shingles, install new aluminum gutters, repair dormers, replace existing wood windows, install new wood window sills, spot-point the masonry façade, and strip and repaint painted wood elements on the façade of the property. Mr. Musso presented on behalf of the applicant, who was also present. The contractor was also present. The property is immediately adjacent to the Goodrich House (designed by Dempwolf). The applicant is hoping to do a complete renovation and restoration of the property.

The existing roof is a standing seam metal roof, which may be the original roof, with multiple repairs. The roof beams are not standard, and the condition is poor.

The applicant spoke regarding her house and the condition of the house. She feels that her house was built to compliment the Goodritch House, and she would like to renovate her property appropriately.

Mr. Skehan asked if the two houses were connected in any way, and the owner replied that it was possible that there was a connection on the upper story. There is also a hidden room in the house. She wants to restore the façade to be more appropriate to the Dempwolf period. Mr. Redshaw asked if the porch roof was standing seam metal, and the applicant indicated it was. She noted that the Goodritch House recently had a slate roof installed and she would like to do something similar, with an asphalt shingle. She also noted that the metal on the dormers appears to be sheet metal, not standing seam metal.

Mr. Musso indicated that they are proposing to install an architectural shingle. Mr. Shermeyer noted that the board has approved architectural shingles on other properties. Mr. Zumbrun asked if the dormers are original, and Mr. Shermeyer noted that he believes they are original. Ms. Zeller asked if there were any historic photos of this house, or of the Goodritch House, that showed this property. The applicant noted that the other properties on the block had architectural shingles. Mr. Redshaw asked if they would be able to use shingles on the dormers due to the slope, and the contractor noted that yes, if the flashing was installed properly.

Mr. Shermeyer and Ms. Zeller noted that they do not feel that the trim on the dormers originally wrapped around the side. He noted that some of the other trim may have been altered but that the dormers appear to be relatively intact. Ms. Zeller noted that she did not feel the proposed dormer details – including fluted columns - were necessary or appropriate. Mr. Shermeyer noted that he would be okay with the dormers being restored simply. The applicant noted that there is evidence in the paint for the details including the pillars and the dormers. Mr. Shermeyer further noted that he does not see the space for the level of detailed proposed. Ms. Zeller noted that the concern was that the details not be more dressed up than would have been appropriate. Mr. Shermeyer discussed what would have been present historically with this type of dormer and the trim that would have been appropriate. Ms. Zeller noted that a great deal of the evidence does not support the proposed decorative column.

The applicant asked why the Board would not want to approve something more detailed in keeping with the architecture of the house and the neighboring house. Mr. Shermeyer explained that the goal was ensure the historic integrity of the property, and that the original design was simpler than the neighboring house. The contractor noted that there was clear evidence of a crown return, which Mr. Shermeyer concurred with. The contractor further stated that he felt there was evidence (i.e. nail holes that were filled in) to illustrate that there was detail that is now missing. Mr. Redshaw asked if Mr. Shermeyer would be comfortable if the proposed columns were simply a flat board.

Mr. Zumbrun asked the board to review the remainder of the application and revisit the dormer questions.

Mr. Redshaw asked what type of gutters would be installed, and the contractor indicated that they would be wide boxed K gutters, not the half-round that is present. The applicant noted she wanted to match what was on the neighboring building. Mr. Redshaw asked why half-round gutters would not work. The contractor noted that the fascia board is missing behind the gutter, and they will need to replace it. He further noted that he felt the larger K-gutter would drain the water better. Ms. Zeller noted that she would prefer a half round but would not object to the K-gutter. Mr. Shermeyer concurred.

Mr. Musso discussed the window replacements. There are five six-over-six windows that need to be replaced. There is also a rear dormer window that will be replaced with a vinyl window. Mr. Shermeyer asked if the rear dormer was visible from the street, and the applicant indicated no. Mr. Shermeyer noted that the board will therefore not review the rear dormer window.

The applicant detailed the windows present on the building. She explained the basement windows need to be replaced due to the deteriorated condition. She preferred a new vinyl window (Sierra Pacific). The example shown was vinyl with outside grids divided into three panes. These windows will be behind the wrought iron. The applicant noted that the outside noise was very intrusive, and she would like to have better sound proofing with new windows. Mr. Shermeyer noted he was okay with the vinyl windows on the basement windows. Mr. Redshaw noted that he prefers the metal clad wood window over the vinyl option. Mr. Redshaw asked if the basement windows were fixed, and the applicant indicated yes.

The applicant noted that there are seven other windows that need to be replaced - two in the dormers, and five on the façade. Mr. Shermeyer stated that the board would want to see the aluminum clad windows on the façade and in the dormers. He explained that the board does not allow vinyl windows on the facades of buildings. The applicant noted that she was okay with the aluminum clad wood windows on the façade. The window frames will be repaired as needed. The shutters will be removed, dipped, and reinstalled. Mr. Redshaw asked what would be done to the hinges, and Mr. Musso noted that they would likely be dipped as well.

Mr. Musso noted that the mortar that will be fixed and replaced is mainly on the sides and rear and that they will use a high lime content mortar that matches the existing mortar. Mr. Shermeyer noted that the mortar needs to have a higher lime content to allow it to breath.

The Board revisited the dormers and the columns. Ms. Zeller noted that a flat board, instead of the decorative column, would be preferable. Mr. Shermeyer noted that the columns should not be fluted. He noted that he feels more of the dormer elements are original than was presented. He feels that the dormers, as they exist today, are more appropriate to the construction of the building.

Mr. Zumbrun raised the question of the gutters, and if the board had ever approved a K gutter. The consensus was that the Board has not approved a K-gutter on a façade. The applicant noted that the neighboring property has a K-gutter, and Mr. Zumbrun noted that that does not make it acceptable.

Motion: Mr. Shermeyer moved to approve the application with the following stipulations:

- 1 – Metal roof to be replaced with architectural shingle – Timberline Oyster Gray shingle. Also, for the sides of the dormers;
- 2 – That the dormer crown molding and cornice returns be replaced in kind with a ¾ inch thick backboard and step reveal behind it to allow future installation of dormer columns;
- 3 – The owner/contractor will present additional information on past dormer column details to HARB staff for a staff/board review prior to installing a more decorative column;
- 4- The five façade windows and dormer windows will be sierra pacific metal clad wood inserts and the existing frames will be retained
- 5 – Installation of vinyl fixed sash windows in the basement, the basement sills will be repaired/replaced in kind; we are allowing the vinyl sash windows because they are inoperable basement windows behind a metal grill;
- 6 - Replacement of the half-round gutter with K-gutter in this situation only because they will blend with the adjacent house, which is a house museum; for continuity;
- 7 – Touch up mortar repairs with a high lime content mortar and the joint tooling, detail, and color to match existing;
- 8 – Approving a downspout similar to the adjacent house (129 E. Philadelphia Street).
- 9 – Rotted fascia board will be replaced in kind with either wood or a composite material;

Ms. Zeller seconded.

Additional Discussion:

Mr. Kunkle noted that he feels all of the windows are original on the house, due to the condition of the glass (the thickness and the wavy-consistency of the glass). Mr. Kunkle noted that twenty-years ago the Board would have told the applicant to repair the windows and to install interior storm windows. He wanted to note this to show the progression of thought regarding appropriate repairs over time.

Mr. Redshaw asked if the Board needs to review the rear gutter and the proposed stripping and painting. The rear gutter does not need to be reviewed as it is not visible. Mr. Shermeyer stated that the board has no purview on paint color.

Vote: 6-0. Motion approved.

Case #2 – 34-36 E. Philadelphia Street

Discussion:

The applicant is proposing to construct a concrete ramp and landing with handrail, install a canvas awning, replace existing doors and windows, install exterior lighting, spot-repoint mortar at the front façade, repaint painted surfaces, and install a sign on the façade of the property.

The applicant amended the application as follows: no concrete ramp, railing, or handrail; no canvas awning; no handrail; the existing three boarded window openings on the west and south elevation will be filled with block. They are proposing Marvin integrity aluminum clad wood windows on the front and sides. The roof is currently insulated rubber, however it is not visible, so the Board does not have to review the proposed materials. The applicant is going to retain the existing stained glass and the existing detail and is not going to install the previously proposed awnings.

The applicant is proposing to replace the doors. They have two options – fiberglass with wood frame or a wood door, both will match the existing color palette. Mr. Shermeyer noted that the doors could be original, but the owner noted that the condition was so poor that they could not be repaired. The doors would be in a similar configuration to the existing. Mr. Kunkle asked if the details from 34 or 36 was original. Mr. Kunkle would like to see the decorative element between the door and the transom on 34 E. Philadelphia Street. The element on 36 will be replaced to match. The applicant would like to use the wood grain fiberglass door.

The applicant would like to add flush mounted security lights on the sides of the building. The lighting on the front would be two gooseneck lights on each window.

The existing gutter is in the rear and will be replaced with a new copper gutter.

Mr. Redshaw asked why the handicap ramp was removed from the application, and the applicant noted that they had discussed the accessibility of the building with the City and the City stated that they do not need the ramp at the front as they have accessibility elsewhere on the building.

Motion: Mr. Shermeyer moved to approve the application as presented, allowing the fiberglass door on the front. The surrounds on both doors will be modified to look like #34. Several items were removed from the application – the ramp, the awnings, and the glass block windows. Mr. Redshaw seconded.

Additional Discussion: None.

Vote: 6-0. Motion approved.

Adjourning and next meeting **The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 7:25pm the next scheduled meeting is set for Thursday July 12, 2018.**

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

DRAFT