



**York Historical Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes  
April 8, 2021**

Members in attendance included: Craig Zumbrun (Chair), Robyn Pottorff, Dennis Kunkle (Vice-Chair), Joe Downing, Mark Shermeyer

Absent: Ruth Robbins, Mark Skehan

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 March 25, 2021</b>	--	Motion to approve was made by Mr. Kunkle and seconded by Ms. Pottorff. The minutes were approved with all in favor.
<b>Cases</b>	The following cases were presented.	The following applications were approved as described below.

**Case #1 - 484-486 W Philadelphia Street:** A request by Royal Square Development & Construction for demolition of the property in favor of a vacant, grassy area.

**Discussion:** The application was previously reviewed at the March 11, 2021 HARB Meeting, at which time it was tabled until the applicant could provide an engineering report indicating whether the building is structurally compromised. Keven Hubble of Royal Square Development and Construction noted that the HARB has now received the report prepared by C. S. Davidson Engineering, which indicates that the building is impaired beyond feasible repair. Rot, damage, and foundation failure were all noted.

Mr. Zumbrun noted that the report was unclear as to whether the foundation and other structural damage noted therein was located within the historic portion of the building or within later additions. The applicant noted that the buildings are all connected on the interior and the damage is throughout. Mr.

Kunkle noted that he read the report and felt that it supported the demolition of the building, as it noted that multiple structural interventions undertaken in recent years have failed. Mr. Shermeyer noted that the foundation appears to have collapsed near the juncture of the original building and its rear ell and that sagging is visible from the exterior. The applicant confirmed that the foundation has slumped into the building along Philadelphia Street and that interventions to support the foundation along the Hartley Street façade are now failing and the foundation is beginning to move inward in that location as well. Mr. Shermeyer noted that the neighboring building had been claimed by a sinkhole, and the subsidence issues in the ground surrounding the building are likely affecting this property as well.

**Motion:** Mr. Kunkle motioned to approve the application as presented, noting that the HARB would not typically approve demolition of an existing historic building with good integrity in favor of a vacant lot but this property has been subject to neglect for many years prior to its purchase by the current owner and the current condition reflects a general public hazard as supported by the engineering report prepared by C. S. Davidson. Mr. Downing seconded.

**Additional Discussion:** Mr. Shermeyer noted that the condition of this building is a special case and while the HARB would not typically support demolition of a property with so much local historic importance and intact historic features, the property has become a danger to the public.

**Vote:** 5-0 – the motion to approve the application was passed with all in favor.

**Case #2 – 245 E Prospect Street:** A request by Chuck Bowie for the installation of a vinyl fence to enclose the rear yard and a vinyl gate fronting on E Prospect Street.

**Discussion:** Mr. Bowie noted that he has owned the property since 2008 and would now like to enclose the rear yard. The yard is adjacent to a park with a low fence and park-goers occasionally climb the fence to cut through his yard.

Mr. Kunkle asked whether the applicant had gotten quotes on multiple fencing types in addition to the proposed vinyl fence. The applicant indicated that he also priced a chain link fence that was cost prohibitive. Mr. Kunkle asked whether the applicant would consider using a wood fence and the applicant indicated that he would prefer a wood fence but assumed that the HARB would prefer the appearance of a white vinyl fence. The Board noted that since vinyl is a much newer, non-historic material that a wood fence with flat or dog-eared pickets would be more historically appropriate within the historic district. Mr. Bowie confirmed that he would be happy to install a wood fence with dog-eared details (and not a stockade style fence).

**Motion:** Mr. Shermeyer motioned to approve the installation of a new, solid wood privacy fence and a wood gate with dog-eared pickets to enclose the rear yard of the property. Mr. Downing seconded.

**Additional Discussion:** The Board clarified the difference between a dog-eared and stockade style fence and the applicant indicated he would install a dog-eared fence.

**Vote:** 5-0 – the motion to approve the application as amended was passed with all in favor.

**Case #3 – 35 W Maple Street:** A request by the Susquehanna Property Group, LLC for the replacement of a historic “Yankee” gutter with a new “K” style gutter.

**Discussion:** The applicant, Joei Darrah, explained that the soffit was noted to be failing during a recent building inspection. When the condition was further investigated it was discovered that the beams supporting the historic Yankee gutter were rotted and failing. Large sections of the gutter and overhang assembly had to be removed to prevent the damaged members from falling into the public right-of-way. The applicant is hoping to avoid reconstructing the Yankee gutter and is seeking a more economical solution.

The Board noted that the Yankee gutter was present on the front and side elevations, and the applicant noted that most of the damage is present on the front and on the east side. Mr. Zumbrun noted that HARB would usually require retention of this feature, however, since the original feature has now deteriorated to the point where it is no longer present, recreation of the original design would be difficult and likely prohibitively expensive. He questioned whether a half round gutter would be more appropriate than the proposed K-Style gutter. Mr. Shermeyer noted that this building has unfortunately lost all of its architectural detailing. He noted that if the soffit were reframed to its original proportion that the installation of a half round gutter would be appropriate. The applicant noted that he was hoping to shorten the overhang, and Mr. Shermeyer noted that the current roof overhang on the mansard appears likely to have been extended beyond its original depth and stated a depth of 12 or so inches would be appropriate.

The Board generally noted the vinyl siding covering the mansard roof is likely to be problematic as vinyl siding is not intended to be a roofing material. The Board noted that they hoped when the homeowner looks to replace the material that they will come before the Board to request the installation of architectural shingles as a replacement material. The applicant noted that they are likely to do that in the future.

**Motion:** Mr. Kunkle motioned to approve the application, as amended from the original, to include the rebuilding of the existing mansard roof overhang and soffit to a depth of 12 inches and the installation of a half round gutter and round downspouts held close to the building. Ms. Pottorff seconded.

**Additional Discussion:** N/A

**Vote:** 5-0. The motion to approve the application as amended passed with all in favor.

**Case #4 – 383 E Market Street:** A request by Adrienne Williams of Williams Architects for the in-kind replacement of historic wood siding on a three-story bay and the permanent enclosure of two basement windows.

**Discussion:** The applicant noted that the property is located at East Market and Broad. The historic wood siding on the three-story projecting bay was damaged in a recent windstorm. The applicant proposes to replace it with custom-milled, thermally modified wood siding. The existing trim and cornice will be retained and repainted. If replacement of corner boards and trim is discovered to be necessary due to dry rot, the members will be replaced in-kind with custom-milled (but not thermally modified) lumber. The applicant also noted that the basement-level windows are proposed to be permanently bricked in due to vandalization.

Mr. Kunkle asked whether the masonry to enclose the windows will be inset to show the outline of the historic opening or whether the masonry would be flush to the face off the building. Ms. Williams noted that the masonry would be flush and would be painted to match the surrounding wall.

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

**Additional Discussion:** N/A

**Vote:** 5-0, the motion to approve the application as presented passed with all in favor.

**Other Business:** Preliminary review of an in-kind replacement window on the property at 56 S Duke Street. Sarah Van Vleet of Royal Square Development and Construction presented a proposal for the in-kind replacement of two, upper-story windows on the property. The windows were damaged in a recent windstorm and are proposed for in-kind replacement using custom-made wood sashes. The Board indicated support of the proposed replacement and noted that the application could be approved by Staff Review once submitted.

**Adjourning and next meeting**      **The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 pm the next scheduled meeting is set for Thursday April 22, 2021.**

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