



**York Historical Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes  
August 13, 2020**

Members in attendance included: Craig Zumbun (Chair), Dennis Kunkle (Vice-Chair), Robyn Pottorff, Ruth Robbins

Absent: Mark Shermeyer, Mark Skehan, Joe Downing

Consultant: Christine Leggio, 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 July 23, 2020</b>	--	Motion to approve was made by Ms. Pottorff and seconded by Mr. Kunkle. The minutes were approved by a vote of 4-0 with all in favor.
<b>Cases</b>	The following cases were presented.	The following applications were denied and approved.

**Case #1 – 46-48 W Princess Street:** A request by Anthony Klopp of EHC Associates for the demolition of the building on the property.

**Discussion:** The application was presented by Anthony Klopp, Contractor, who noted that the property is owned by St. Patrick’s church and is located within 15 feet of a playground. He stated that the building is in disrepair and the church would like to demolish it in order to claim more open space for the adjacent school’s use.

Mr. Kunkle asked how long the church had owned the property and the applicant indicated that the church has possessed it since about the 1970s. He also indicated that the property had been vacant of tenants for approximately two years.

Mr. Kunkle asked whether an engineer's report substantiating that the property is hazardous and an imminent threat to public health. The applicant indicated that no such report has been completed.

Ms. Pottorff asked whether the playground was in its current location adjacent to the building when it was last occupied, and the applicant confirmed it was.

Mr. Zumbrun noted that the Board has approved demolition before, but usually in cases where the reuse value of the property is negligible or where harm is imminent. He noted that this building does not meet those conditions and that removing it would remove a usable historic resource from the district. Ms. Pottorff agreed and noted that recommending demolishing a historic resource in favor of open space isn't appropriate.

The applicant reiterated that the building is in poor condition and stated that he would like to submit additional information, including pictures and possibly an engineer's report. He noted that if an engineer were to report that the building was structurally sound, the applicant is unlikely to agree given the conditions he has viewed on site. Mr. Zumbrun noted that the Board had never received a demolition application for a property that an engineer had reported as "safe". He noted that HARB is an advisory Board and although they may not recommend that Council approve demolition of the property, that Council is within its rights to disregard the Board's recommendation. Mr. Zumbrun noted that the building is somewhat unique, and that demolition is a last resort and HARB only recommends demolition of historic properties sparingly.

**Motion:** Mr. Kunkle motioned to deny the application as presented. Ms. Robbins seconded.

**Additional Discussion:** N/A

**Vote:** 4-0; the application to demolish the property is denied with all in favor.

**Case #2 – 430-432 S George Street:** A request by Pamela D Sexton for the construction of a concrete patio and walkway, replacement of an existing fence, repair of a masonry flower bed, and installation of a shed on the property.

**Discussion:** The application was presented by Ms. Sexton, who noted that the majority of the work was already complete, because she was not aware of the permitting requirements.

The Board inquired about what was on the lot prior to the installation of the patio, and the applicant stated it was vacant. The Board noted that the patio and walkway were not readily visible from the street due to the installation of the fence, which was an in-kind replacement. Mr. Kunkle noted that the constructed elements did not detract from any historic architectural features.

Ms. Sexton noted that the work to the flower bed at the front of the property had not yet been completed and that approval was required for that work as well. She stated that the brickwork would be replaced in-kind.

**Motion:** Mr. Kunkle motioned to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Pottorff seconded.

**Additional Discussion:** N/A

**Vote:** 4-0; the application is approved as presented with all in favor.

**Case #3 – 121 N Pershing Avenue:** A request by Erin Himmelberger of Warehouse for the renovation of the property, including a new addition.

**Discussion:** The application was presented by Erin Himmelberger, who noted described the proposed project, as shown on the submitted plans. Ms. Himmelberger noted that the project will include the demolition of a coal retaining wall at the north edge of the property, which is in a ruinous state, and a small historic addition off a main building which is believed to have been used to store a generator. She noted that although they would like to use the room for storage of a new generator, it is undersized and will not provide the required airflow to meet current code. She also noted that a small maintenance building on the property, constructed of concrete block, will be retained and clad in metal siding. She noted that some window openings in the two larger historic buildings on the property have been in appropriately infilled. Some of these will be restored to operable windows, while others will be more appropriately infilled using matching brick and retaining the historic sills and lintels. An overhead door on the first story of one of the main buildings which was previously made smaller will be restored to its original size. The metal and glass addition that will be constructed to join the two main buildings will be set back from the facades to help retain the prominence off the historic buildings on the street.

Mr. Zumbrun asked what the proposed use for the concrete block maintenance building would be and the applicant stated it would be used for storage of maintenance equipment. Mr. Zumbrun noted that he was troubled by the choice of metal siding for the building and asked why it was chosen. The applicant noted that it was chosen for durability and because it could be easily insulated. She noted that the small building is not of the same historic period as the main buildings on the site and is not a focal point within the complex.

**Motion:** Mr. Kunkle motioned to approve the application as presented. Ms. Pottorff seconded.

**Additional Discussion:** N/A

**Vote:** 4-0; the application is approved as presented with all in favor.

**Other Business:** N/A

**Adjourning and next meeting**      **The meeting was adjourned by general consent at 7:15 pm the next scheduled meeting is set for Thursday August 23, 2020.**

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