



**York Historical Architectural Review Board
Meeting Minutes
February 11, 2021**

Members in attendance included: Craig Zumbrun (Chair), Dennis Kunkle (Vice-Chair), Joe Downing, Mark Shermeyer, Mark Skehan, Ruth Robbins

Absent: Robyn Pottorff

Consultant: Christine Leggio, JMT Senior Architectural Historian/ 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 January 28, 2021	--	Motion to approve was made by Mr. Skehan and seconded by Mr. Shermeyer. The minutes were approved with all in favor.
Cases	The following cases were presented.	The following applications were approved as described below.

Case #1 - 243 W King Street: A request by Logos Academy for the adaptive reuse of the former Cadillac Place building.

Discussion: The application had several representatives in attendance: Terry Downs, Andrew Blaydon, Christopher Linkey, and Brian Platania. Mr. Blaydon described the proposed project, noting that Logos Academy's main campus is located across King Street from the subject property. The school was originally constructed for grads K-8 but has since expanded to include K-12th grade. The subject property will house classrooms and support spaces for the upper grades.

The proposed work will include the restoration of the exterior stucco on the Cadillac Place building, as well as construction of a small, lobby addition on the east side. The existing storefront glazing system will be replaced by a new, aluminum glazing system that will match the existing. The lobby addition will connect to a bank of existing service bays and will not obscure or alter the main Cadillac Place

building. It will be clad in EFIS siding to match the appearance of the original building's stucco, and in metal siding to match the materials on the existing Logos Academy buildings.

Two buildings on the property will be demolished. These include a 1960s era service station and an 1980s era warehouse. The resulting open area will be used for a parking lot in the short term but will be the future site of additional school buildings which will include a cafeteria and gymnasium which will be developed in Phase II of the project. The applicants will return for approval of that project when it has been fully designed and proposed.

The presented renderings of the project depict a neon sign reading "LOGOS ACADEMY" on the art deco vertical sign board on the façade of the Cadillac Place building. The applicant noted that the sign shown in the rendering is meant to depict the general "vision" for the future sign but that its design is not final, and the applicants will return to HARB for final review of the sign before its installation.

Mr. Kunkle asked whether the 1960s service station proposed for demolition was considered a contributing building within the Historic District and the Preservation Consultant noted that the existing York Historic District Survey data listed the building as non-contributing.

Mr. Shermeyer noted that he likes the proposal and feels that it is a creative adaptation of an architecturally important building which will be beneficial to the surrounding area. Mr. Skehan and Mr. Kunkle agreed.

Motion: Mr. Shermeyer motioned to approve the application as submitted, with the final sign design to be approved in a separate application. Mr. Skehan seconded.

Additional Discussion: N/A

Vote: 6-0; the motion to approve the application as submitted is approved with all in favor.

Case #2 – 243 E Market Street: A request by Brian Crouse for the preliminary review of treatment options for the painting of the side elevation of the property without prior HARB approval.

Discussion: The property owner, Warren Haynie, was in attendance along with contractor Brian Crouse and the previous owners of the property Mary and Larry Humpshire. An application for approval of painting of the west elevation of the house was submitted to HARB in late December and was reviewed at the January 14, 2021 HARB meeting. The applicant was not in attendance at that meeting, and HARB issued a denial of the application based on the assumption that the previously unpainted brick wall that had been painted without prior approval had been in sound condition and was painted for aesthetic reasons.

Mr. Haynie explained that he was unaware of the HARB review requirements when he purchased the house. He noted that he only found out about HARB when he received a notification outlining the HARB violation. Mr. Haynie noted that he had purchased the house because of its age and history and wants to preserve it.

He and his contractor noted that the wall had undergone impact damage as a result of a car accident which resulted in the need to patch a large area with new bricks. The impact also caused cracking, and necessitated rebuilding and reinforcement of the foundation.

Mr. Haynie noted that there was evidence that the side and rear of the house had been painted in its history, the brick is soft, porous, and of lesser quality than that on the front façade of the house. Mr. Shermeyer noted that it was common in the early 1800 for lower quality brick to be used for rear and side facades and that such brick was often painted to protect it.

Mr. Shermeyer noted that he could see from the submitted images of the wall prior to painting that the brick was in a deteriorated state and would likely be problematic. Mr. Haynie noted that he, and his contractor, after speaking with Steve Buffington, have concerns that removal of the paint would cause further damage to the brick façade. Mr. Haynie noted that moisture and dampness problems inside the building have been considerably resolved since the application of the coating.

Mr. Kunkle asked whether the front of the building would be painted, and Mr. Haynie emphatically said that it would not. He noted that he had recently put a good deal of money into repointing that façade and would not cover the original, patterned brick with paint.

Mr. Shermeyer noted that the brick wall was patchy and was not totally intact. He noted that, since many buildings of the period were constructed of brick that was intended to be painted, that HARB would have approved the proposal for painting the wall if an application was submitted prior to the work being conducted. He noted that he hoped that the paint would sufficiently keep moisture out of the building interior.

Mr. Zumbrun noted that the Board had rendered its previous decision without the information presented by the property owner at this meeting. The condition of the brick was previously unknown and was not considered as part of the previous decision. He and the Preservation Consultant noted that the removal of the paint from the compromised brick would be problematic. Mr. Zumbrun noted that the treatment is not inappropriate given the condition of the wall and noted that it would be appropriate for the Board to consider a resolution acknowledging such. Mr. Skehan noted that the HARB does not review choice of color.

Mr. Shermeyer noted that there is no definite evidence that the wall was not historically painted. Mr. Skehan noted that he would have voted to approve the application with the knowledge of the brick's condition.

Motion: Mr. Zumbrun motioned to approve the application as submitted on December 11, 2020, for the painting of the west elevation of the property, in light of presented evidence that the condition of the brick was compromised and with no definite evidence that the building had not been previously painted, and with the stipulation that the front façade of the property will not be painted in the future. Mr. Shermeyer seconded.

Additional Discussion: N/A

Vote: 6-0; the motion is approved with all in favor.

Other Business: N/A

Adjourning and next meeting **The meeting was adjourned at 7:10 pm the next scheduled meeting is set for Thursday February 26, 2021.**

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

DRAFT