



**York Historical Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes  
October 10, 2019**

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

Absent: Ruth Robbins, Rebecca Zeller, Joe Downing, Dave Redshaw, Robyn Pottorff

Consultant: Christine Leggio, JMT Senior Architectural Historian/ HARB Consultant

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION/RESULT
<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> N/A		
<b>Minutes of September 26, 2019</b>		Mr. Kunkle motioned to approve September 26, 2019 minutes. Mr. Skehan seconded. Approved.
<b>Cases</b>	The following cases are approved and preliminarily reviewed with the recommended actions.	

**Case #1 – 215 S George Street:** A request by Moises Sanchez for the installation of adhesive signage on the façade of the building. The sign previously installed by the applicant was not appropriate for the historic district.

**Discussion:** The applicant presented a new sign which is the same basic design as the previously installed sign, however, it is now black and white with the neon colors of the previous design reviewed. The Board noted that the sign is reversible and the subdued color palette

**Motion:** Mr. Skehan motioned to approve the application as submitted and Mr. Shermeyer seconded.

**Additional Discussion:** None.

**Vote:** 4-0. The motion to approve the application is approved with all in favor.

**Case #2 – 246 W Philadelphia Street:** A request by Wesley Ebersole for the restoration of the cornice on the façade of the property.

**Discussion:** The applicant noted that another contractor had begun the work and installed inappropriate particle board in place of removed historic fabric which was deteriorated.

Mr. Shermeyer noted that the replacement elements of the cornice could be the proposed African mahogany or a synthetic material.

Mr. Kunkle asked whether the inappropriately installed K-style gutter would be replaced, and the applicant stated that it would be replaced with a half-round gutter.

Mr. Zumbrun asked whether the removed corbels would be replaced in-kind and the applicant stated that they would be replicated in kind.

**Motion:** Mr. Shermeyer motioned to approve the application as presented and Mr. Skehan seconded.

**Additional Discussion:** None.

**Vote:** 4-0 – Motion to approve the application as presented is passed with all in favor.

**Case #3 – 470 E Market Street:** A request by Dennis T Diamond for preliminary review of options for altering the property.

**Discussion:** The applicant stated that he recently acquired the property. His tenant is interested in making changes to the building including a potential addition or demolition and rebuilding.

The property is the old Eastern Market building, a surviving market house from the late-19<sup>th</sup> century.

The applicant purchased the property as an investment and is interested in which changes would be allowable and wants to know whether the property is really historically significant and noted that the property isn't highly visible from Market Street due to a car lot property in front of it.

The Board noted that the building is significant as a surviving market house.

Mr. Shermeyer noted that an addition could be allowable depending on the design, location, etc. The applicant noted that the tenant would like to expand his manufacturing business in the building but would need to enlarge it. He proposed restoring the façade and expanding on the side or at the rear of the property.

Mr. Zumbrun noted that the property is near to a property that was fully restored in keeping with SOI standards and noted that the Eastern Market building has high potential to be a valuable resource if properly restored or adaptively reused.

Mr. Shermeyer noted that the existing lot doesn't have much room for expansion on either side due to zoning and setback restrictions. The applicant noted that the tenant proposed adding a shed roof addition on each side at an approximately 15-foot eave height.

The Board noted that there are many constraints based on zoning, stormwater management, and other requirements and noted that the first step should be to consult with the zoning office and a civil engineer to determine what would be possible on the site.

Mr. Shermeyer noted that the façade facing Market Street is the most significant. Mr. Zumbrun stated that he would hope that a solution to enlarge the building while maintaining its character defining features in keeping with SOI standards.

The Board encouraged the applicant to work with a professional design/planning team and reiterated that zoning requirements will be the biggest driver of what is allowable on site and that the applicant should return to the HARB with a proposal once a feasible plan of work can be established. They noted that they are pleased that the applicant came to discuss options for the site. They asserted that they would not be in support of demolition of the property and encourage the applicant to seek options that would maintain the significant aspects of the property while adapting it to a new use.

**Motion: --**

**Additional Discussion: --**

**Vote: --**

**Other Business: N/A**

**Adjourning and next meeting**      **The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 6:40 pm the next scheduled meeting is set for Thursday October 24, 2019.**

**Minutes recorded by Christine Leggio, JMT Senior Architectural Historian/HARB Consultant.**