



**York Historical Architectural Review Board  
Meeting Minutes  
May 13, 2021**

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

Absent: Robyn Pottorff, Ruth Robbins, Mark Skehan

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>	--	--
<b>Minutes of April 22, 2021</b>	--	Motion to approve was made by Mr. Kunkle and seconded by Mr. Downing. The minutes were approved with all in favor.
<b>Cases</b>	The following cases were presented.	The following applications were approved and withdrawn as described below.

**Case #1 - 625 S George Street:** A request by YWCA York c/o Rexann Richards for the replacement of 58 existing historic windows with new, composite replacement windows.

**Discussion:** The proposed project will replace all of the windows on the historic portion of the property except for those that are stained glass. The existing windows are a mix of pane configurations, including nine-over-one, two-over-two, and one-over-one. The applicant would like to replace all of the windows with replacement units with a one-over-one configuration. A ca. 1965 addition contains a large bow window with 12 panes. The proposal would replace the bowed window with four, vertically oriented casement windows or a combination of two fixed panes flanked by casement windows.

Mr. Shermeyer noted that some of the historic, multi-paned windows had been replaced with one-over-one windows during the building's history. The Board generally agreed that the windows in the ca. 1965 addition are not character defining features of the building and can be altered.

The Board discussed the mix of multi-pane and single-pane windows and generally agreed that replacement with one-over-one windows would be appropriate as long as the historic proportions and the stained-glass windows are maintained.

**Motion:** Mr. Shermeyer motioned to approve the application as presented, to consist of the replacement of the existing non-stained-glass windows with a metal-clad wood product in a cream-colored finish to match the trim throughout, utilizing a one-over-one pane configuration maintaining the proportions of the existing historic windows. The bow window on the ca. 1965 addition shall be replaced with four, vertically oriented single-pane windows. Mr. Downing seconded.

**Additional Discussion:** N/A

**Vote:** 4-0 – the motion to approve the application was passed with all in favor.

**Case #2 – 353 E King Street:** A request by Genevieve Williams for the replacement of an existing wood porch with a new concrete stoop.

**Discussion:** The applicant was not audible during the meeting. The Board noted questions about the proposed railing.

**Motion:** Mr. Shermeyer motioned to approve the application until such time that the applicant could provide additional information about the proposed work, and Mr. Downing seconded.

**Additional Discussion:** N/A

**Vote:** 4-0 – the motion to table the application as submitted was passed with all in favor.

**Case #3 – 249 E Market Street:** A request by Vince and Beth Bulik for the replacement of 10 existing windows with new, composite replacement units.

**Discussion:** The proposed project will replace all of the windows on the first and second stories on the front façade. All of the windows on the house are six-over-six divided light windows, except for four windows on a projecting bay on the second story. The applicant discussed the possibility of making all of the window configurations consistent – either all six-over-six, or all one-over-one.

Mr. Shermeyer noted that the bay window on the Federal style building would have been added later in its history, at a time when one-over-one windows were historically trendy. It would be most historically appropriate to retain the divided light configuration where present and retain one-over-one windows on the bay.

Mr. Zumbrun asked whether any changes were proposed to the third floor dormer windows and the applicant noted that they would not be altered.

**Motion:** Mr. Shermeyer motioned to approve the installation of new, six-over-six Interstate composite simulated divided light windows to replace the existing six-over-six historic windows on the first and

second story windows, and the installation of new, one-over-one Interstate composite windows with no light divisions on the second story projecting bay. Mr. Downing seconded.

**Additional Discussion:** N/A

**Vote:** 4-0. The motion to approve the application as amended passed with all in favor.

**Case #4** – 46 S Pershing Avenue: A request by Sandie Walker for the replacement of existing windows on the property.

**Discussion:** The proposal to replace the windows is being supported by volunteer labor. Two proposals were examined: replacement with vinyl-clad wood replacement units or replacement with fiberglass-clad wood replacement units. In either case, the replacement units will match the existing pane configuration (a mix of 9-light and six-light windows), size, and proportion of the historic windows. The difference in cost between the vinyl-clad and fiberglass-clad windows is approximately \$5,000 and as a result, the applicant requests approval of the vinyl option.

Mr. Shermeyer and Mr. Zumbrun explained that vinyl products are not historically appropriate for the district and the HARB does not generally approve them for use on facades that are visible from the public right-of-way within the district. The Board noted that approval of vinyl units on the Pershing or parking lot side of the building would set a precedent, but that they would be allowable on the rear façade.

**Motion:** Mr. Kunkle motioned to approve the in-kind replacement of the existing 9-light and 6-light windows with new, fiberglass-clad replacement units on the Pershing Avenue and parking-lot facing facades, and the in-kind replacement of the existing windows on the rear façade with vinyl-clad replacement units. Mr. Downing seconded.

**Additional Discussion:** N/A

**Vote:** 4-0. The motion to approve the application as amended passed with all in favor.

**Case #5** – 90 N Newberry Street: A request by James Baumgardener for the construction of a new community park in the rear of the YMCA parking lot.

**Discussion:** Mr. Baumgardener noted that the YMCA of York will be creating a new play area which will be partially funded by DCNR. The park will be constructed on an existing surface parking lot and will include a black aluminum perimeter fence with brick piers enclosed by a low curb. The design includes a decorative entrance with signage and perimeter landscaping. The interior of the park will include grassy areas, pickleball courts, and various play equipment. Lighting will be included at the entrance and within the park, and the perimeter fence will allow the park to be closed at night.

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

**Additional Discussion:** N/A

**Vote:** 4-0. The motion to approve the application as amended passed with all in favor.

**Case #2** – 353 E King Street: A request by Genevieve Williams for the replacement of an existing wood porch with a new concrete stoop.

**Discussion:** The proposed work will include the replacement of an existing wood porch with a new, concrete porch. Owing to technical difficulties, the applicant was not audible during the meeting and the application was briefly tabled, however, the applicant provided answers to the Board's questions to the HARB consultant via email and the Board reopened the case.

Mr. Shermeyer noted that the Board would be amenable to approval of the concrete step replacement if the existing historic railing is retained. The applicant indicated that the railing will be repaired and reinstalled if its condition allows.

The Board noted that there are other concrete stoops on the block and that the existing wood stair is in poor condition.

**Motion:** Mr. Downing motioned to approve the application as submitted, and Mr. Kunkle seconded.

**Additional Discussion:** N/A

**Vote:** 4-0 – the motion to approve the application as submitted was passed with all in favor.

**Case #6** – 363 W Philadelphia Street: A request by Elizabeth A Leaman for the replacement of three existing windows with new, Ply Gem American Standard vinyl replacement units.

**Discussion:** The Board noted that the HARB does not typically approve vinyl windows, but that a composite or fiberglass product would be appropriate. The applicant noted that the installation will not alter the size of the window or overall appearance of the building. The Board noted that vinyl windows have durability issues and are not typically made in proportions that mimic historic windows. Vinyl replacement units are not typically approved on visible facades within the district. The Board noted that they would not be amenable to an exception in this case, given the visibility of the windows to the surrounding district.

The applicant opted to withdraw the application.

**Motion:** N/A

**Additional Discussion:** N/A

**Vote:** N/A

**Case #7** – 250 W King Street: A request by Logos Academy for the construction of a new playground on existing, vacant land.

**Discussion:** Mr. Sandmeyer presented the application on behalf of the Logos Academy. The play area will be located on existing vacant land and will be surrounded by an ornamental fence. The interior of the play area will include a soft play surface and various play equipment.

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

**Additional Discussion:** N/A

**Vote:** 4-0. The motion to approve the application as amended passed with all in favor.

**Case #8** – 55 S Queen Street: A request by Daniel Redding for the replacement of existing windows with new, Andersen 100 Series replacement units.

**Discussion:** Mr. Redding noted that the proposed replacement units are Andersen 100 Series Fibrex windows, matching the existing grid pattern in-kind with simulated divided lights. The existing shutters are vinyl shutters screwed into the wall.

The Board noted that the existing vinyl shutters could be replaced in-kind, or removed entirely, since they are not historic. Mr. Shermeyer noted that it is likely that the building did not historically include shutters due to the spacing between the windows, which is not quite enough to accommodate shutters that would fit the window openings.

Mr. Redding amended the proposal to include removal of the shutters without replacement.

**Motion:** Mr. Shermeyer motioned to approve the installation of Andersen 100 Series Fibrex windows with six-over-six simulated divided lights and the removal of the existing shutters. Mr. Downing seconded.

**Additional Discussion:** N/A

**Vote:** 4-0. The motion to approve the application as amended passed with all in favor.

**Other Business:** N/A

**Adjourning and next meeting**      **The meeting was adjourned at 7:00 pm the next scheduled meeting is set for Thursday May 27, 2021.**

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