



**York Historical Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes**

December 11, 2025, | 101 S George St, York PA 17401

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT
Dennis Kunkle, Chair Mark Shermeyer Mark Skehan Blake Gifford Carlos Santiago Lauren McLane- Gross	Sarah O'Brien Craig Zumbrun, Vice Chair	Nancy Griffin
AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION/RESULT
<b>Welcome and call to order.</b>		<b>Mr. Kunkle called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.</b>
<b>Changes to the agenda</b>		<b>No Changes.</b>
<b>Minutes of previous meeting</b>		<b>Mr. Skehan made a motion to accept, Mr. Gifford 2<sup>nd</sup>. Unanimous.</b>
<b>Cases</b>	The following case was considered as described below.	

**Case #1 – 413, 417, 423 W. MARKET ST.**

THE EXISTING BUILDINGS ROOF AND CONDITION ARE IN NEED OF REPAIR. THERE IS ONE METAL ROOF WITH MANY PATCHES TO STOP LEAKS. I PROPOSE TO DORMER EACH ROOF ADDING A FULL 3<sup>RD</sup> FLOOR TO THE EXISTING BUILDINGS AND BRING THE 2 MIDDLE BUILDINGS EVEN WITH THE BRICK BUILDING TO GIVE A BETTER FAÇADE TO THE NEIGHBORHOOD. ADDED LIGHTING IN OVER THE DOORWAYS TO SOFTEN THE AREA. BEFORE AND AFTER PICTURES OF THE FACE OF THE BUILDING WILL GIVE A BETTER LOOK INTO WHAT THIS SECTION NEEDS TO BE BROUGHT UP MODERN AND ELEGANT. PLAN DETAILS FOR THE NEW LAYOUT AFTERTHEW COMPLETION OF THE WORK TO THE BUILDINGS.

Mr. Shermeyer made a motion to table the application pending City Planning and Zoning review and submission of final permit drawings, with the Board expressing support for the concept of adding shed dormers and use of one-over-one Crystal PVC window, Mr. Skehan 2<sup>nd</sup>. Unanimous.

**Discussion:**

**Summary:**

**Applicant:** *Returning applicant*

**Summary:**

- Applicant returned following zoning review; zoning had no comments or objections.
- Board noted missing or incomplete drawing sets in the current materials.
- Discussion focused on locating the elevation drawings previously submitted at the initial meeting.
- Staff confirmed zoning approval and referenced previous feedback.
- Members recalled that drawings were reviewed at a prior meeting and no objections were raised at that time.

**Action:**

*Mr. Skehan made a motion to accept, Mr. Gifford 2<sup>nd</sup>. Unanimous.*

**Case #2 – 9 E. PHILADELPHIA ST. (15 E. PHILADELPHIA ST.)**

ALTHOUGH HARB APPROVED THE PROJECT, THEY WANTED ME TO RETURN TO FINALIZE THE COLOR SCHEME.

**Discussion:**

- **Summary:**  
Applicant presented updated color scheme after earlier Board concerns (yellow corners).
- Revised palette includes: light blue, dark blue (“deep ocean”), khaki, arctic white, and a hard gray.
- Windows to be black-framed; signage to be black sheet metal with backlit LED cutouts.
- Rear elevations to use AB Martin / APM vertical metal panels.
- West elevation includes panelized patterning; balcony posts and privacy panels to be black to match fascia.
- Board discussed:
  - Number of colors (five total).
  - Concerns about “color clumping” and whether any panels could be redistributed.
  - Design intent of using odd-numbered color sets.
  - Modern aesthetic vs. context.
- Applicant noted willingness to adjust panel arrangement if feasible.

Approve the color scheme and panel design as submitted, with the recommendation (but not requirement) to redistribute some panels to reduce color clustering.

**Action:**

*Ms. Gross made a motion to accept, Mr. Gifford 2<sup>nd</sup>. Unanimous.*

**Case # 3 - 308 S. GEORGE ST. – No Show**

RESTORE EXISTING VACANT CONDEMNED SINGLE-FAMILY DWELLING. INSTALL HARB COMPLIANT DOORS AND WINDOWS.

**Discussion:**

**Summary:**

**Action:**

*Mr. Shermeyer moved to table, Ms. Gross 2<sup>nd</sup>. Unanimous.*

**Case # 4 - 252 E. PRINCESS ST.**

WE ARE REPAIRING/REBUILDING 252 E. PRINCESS ST BALCONY LOCATED ON THE SIDE OF THE BUILDING REBUILDING/REPLACING INKIND AS IS THE PORCHES WERE DAMAGED IN A FIRE ON OCTOMBER 23, 2025 IN REPLACING/REBUILDING AS IS 6X6, 4X4 PT POSTS WILL BE USED 5 ¼ DECK 2X 10 FOR JOIST 23X4'S FOR RAILING AGAIN EVERYTHING WILL BE PT MATERIALS I MAY SOME CONCRETE ALSO EVERYTHING WILL BE UPDATED TO MEET CODE SUCH HANGERS, BOLTS, SIMPSON BRACKETS.

**Discussion:**

- ☐ Existing balconies were likely constructed without permits and used pressure-treated lumber not historically appropriate.
- ☐ Board emphasized:
  - Preference for historically appropriate profiles/materials.

- Pressure-treated wood railings not acceptable.
  - Recommended PVC or exterior wood with historically correct profiles.
- ☐ Staff provided standard approved railing profiles from Myer's Millwork.

**Summary:**

**Action:**

*Mr. Shermeyer moved to approve the application as submitted with the following modifications:*

*Railing system to use historically appropriate profiles:*

- 8840 PF rail cap (or equivalent)
  - 8841 PF base rail (or equivalent)
  - 237 SPF square balusters
- ☐ Materials may be exterior wood or PVC.
- ☐ Posts (4×4 or 6×6) to be square and painted.
- ☐ Applies to both first and second-floor balcony railings.

*Mr. Gifford 2<sup>nd</sup>. Unanimous.*

**Case # 5 – 138 E. MARKET ST.**

THE BUILDING LOCATED AT 138 E MARKET STREET WAS BUILT IN 1910 AND HAS BEEN HOME TO VARIOUS USES OVER THE CENTURY. MOST CURRENTLY THE BUILDING WAS OCCUPIED BY A LAW FIRM. Its PREVIOUS OWNERSHIP HAS BEEN BY VARIOUS RELIGIOUS ORGANIZATIONS, BUSINESSES FOR OFFICE USE, AND ALSO SERVED AS A VFW. IT IS CONSTRUCTED FROM A STONE FOUNDATION, MULTI-WYTHE BRICK EXTERIOR WALLS WITH WOOD FRAMED INTERIORS, AND HAS SEVERAL WOOD FRAMED ADDITIONS TO THE REAR AND SIDE OF THE BUILDING.

**SCOPE OF WORK:**

**WINDOW REPLACEMENT:** THE EXISTING BUILDING CONSISTS OF WOOD AND VINYL SINGLE HUNG WINDOW UNITS ON THE FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD FLOORS, ALONG WITH A WOODEN STOREFRONT SYSTEM ON THE FIRST FLOOR ALONG MARKET STREET. ALL WINDOWS TO THE REAR OF THE STRUCTURE SHALL BE REPLACED WITH SINGLE HUNG VINYL PELLA WINDOWS TO MATCH EXISTING STYLES AND SIZES. ON THE FRONT OF THE BUILDING ALONG MARKET STREET, THE SECOND AND THIRD FLOOR WOOD WINDOWS SHALL BE REPLACED WITH ALUMINUM CLAD WOOD PELLA RESERVE WINDOWS TO MATCH THE EXISTING SIZES AND SITE LINES. FOR THESE EIGHT (8) UNITS, THE WOOD WINDOWSILLS AND HEADS SHALL BE REPAIRED OR REPLACED, IN KIND, AS REQUIRED TO MATCH THE EXISTING DIMENSIONS. THE EXISTING ALUMINUM STOREFRONT SHALL REMAIN AND BE REPAIRED AS REQUIRED TO ENSURE A WEATHER TIGHT SEAL. THREE (3) WINDOWS TO THE REAR OF THE BUILDING ON THE WEST SIDE OF THE FAÇADE ARE TO BE REMOVED AND INFILLED WITH NEW VINYL SIDING ON THE EXTERIOR. (SEE PHOTOS A, D, E, G, H) **CORNICE AND TRIM:** THE EXISTING BUILDING FAÇADE HAS TWO WOODEN CORNICES WHICH SHALL BE REPAIRED IN KIND TO MATCH THE EXISTING CONSTRUCTION. EACH CORNICE SHALL BE PAINTED ONCE REPAIRED. THE EXISTING WINDOWS HAVE WOODEN TRIM AT THE HEAD AND SILL WHICH SHOULD BE REPAIRED OR REPLACED, IN KIND, AS REQUIRED. AT THE EXISTING VESTIBULE ENTRY, THE WOOD TRIM SHALL BE REPAIRED OR REPLACED, IN KIND, TO MATCH THE EXISTING CONDITIONS AND DIMENSIONS. THIS TRIM SHALL BE PAINTED. (SEE PHOTOS B, D, E)

**DOOR REPLACEMENT:** THE EXISTING MAIN ENTRY DOOR FROM THE MARKET STREET SIDE IS A FULL LITE WOOD DOOR. THIS DOOR SHALL REMAIN AND BE REPAIRED AS REQUIRED AND RECEIVE A NEW PAINT FINISH. ADJACENT TO THE MAIN MARKET STREET ENTRANCE, IS AN EXISTING DOOR TO THE BASEMENT. THIS DOOR SHALL BE REPLACED WITH A NEW INSULATED METAL DOOR TO MATCH THE NEW COLOR OF THE EXISTING DOOR AND

TRIM. THE EXISTING METAL DOOR TO THE REAR OF THE STRUCTURE SHALL BE REPLACED WITH A NEW INSULATED METAL DOOR. EXISTING DOORS ON THE SECOND AND THIRD FLOOR NOT VISIBLE FROM THE EXTERIOR SHALL BE REPLACED WITH INSULATED METAL DOORS. (SEE PHOTOS C, E, G, H)

VINYL SIDING REPLACEMENT: THE EXISTING FAÇADE TO THE REAR OF THE BUILDING IS CLAD WITH VINYL SIDING ON THE UPPER TWO FLOORS, WHILE THE FAÇADE AT GRADE IS PAINTED CONCRETE BLOCK. THIS SIDING AT THE UPPER FLOORS SHALL BE REMOVED TO THE EXISTING SHEATHING. A NEW LAYER OF CONTINUOUS INSULATION SHALL BE INSTALLED WITH NEW VINYL SIDING OVER TOP. THE NEW VINYL SIDING WILL HAVE A 4" PROFILE REVEAL. THE EXISTING CONCRETE BLOCK SHALL BE REPAINTED TO MATCH THE UPPER FLOOR SIDING COLOR. ALL NEW SIDING SHALL REMAIN NEUTRAL IN COLOR. (SEE PHOTOS G, H)

EXTERIOR RAMP: AT THE REAR OF THE BUILDING, THERE IS AN EXISTING NON-COMPLIANT RAMP FROM THE PARKING LOT TO THE REAR ENTRY DOOR. THIS RAMP SHALL BE REMOVED AT DIRECTION OF THE CITY, FOR A NEW ADA-COMPLIANT RAMP TO BE INSTALLED. NEW GUARD AND HANDRAILS SHALL BE PROVIDED TO MEET ADA REQUIREMENTS. AS PART OF THE NEW RAMP WORK, THE EXISTING CANOPY SHALL BE REMOVED AS IT'S CONDITION IS BEYOND REPAIR. A NEW CANOPY WILL BE INSTALLED SIMILAR TO THE EXISTING. (SEE PHOTO J)

ENTRY VESTIBULE TILE: THE EXISTING MARKET STREET ENTRYWAY VESTIBULE TILE SHALL BE CLEANED AND REPAIRED AS REQUIRED WITH MATERIAL TO MATCH THE EXISTING CONSTRUCTION TYPE, COLOR, AND FINISH. (SEE PHOTO C)

EXTERIOR SIGNAGE: THE STOREFRONT ALONG MARKET STREET SHALL RECEIVE NEW SIGNAGE APPLIED TO GLAZING. THERE WILL BE NEW SIGNAGE ABOVE AND BESIDE THE EXISTING VESTIBULE ENTRY. NO NEW SIGNAGE SHALL BE ILLUMINATED ON THE BUILDING

**Discussion:**

- ☐ Board discussed visibility of rear windows from public way; noted distance and alley orientation make vinyl acceptable.
- ☐ Additions at rear noted as non-historic.

**Summary:**

**Scope:** Exterior repairs and replacements to doors, windows, siding, and ramp.

**Front (Market Street)**

- Wood storefront elements to be repaired in place and repainted.
- Second and third-floor windows (currently wood single-hung) to be replaced with aluminum-clad wood Pella Reserve windows matching existing dimensions and appearance.
- Vestibule wood framing to be repaired and repainted.
- Basement door (existing insulated metal) to be replaced with new insulated metal door, painted to match front façade colors.

**Rear (Mason Ave / Alley)**

- Existing vinyl windows to be replaced with new vinyl windows.
- Painted masonry block to be repainted to match proposed new vinyl siding (off-white or green).
- New vinyl siding (typical 5 in. reveal) proposed for upper stories.
- Existing noncompliant ADA ramp to be replaced with compliant ramp; approx. 2 ft wider and longer.
- Existing failed fabric canopy to be re-skinned.



**Action:**

*Mr. Gifford moved to approve, Mr. Skehan 2nd. Unanimous.*

**408 W. MARKET ST. – PRELIMINARY REVIEW ONLY**

**Union Lutheran Church – Proposed Redevelopment & Demolition  
Discussion**

**Purpose of Meeting**

The hearing focused on whether and how Union Lutheran Church (408 W. Market Street) could be redeveloped to provide workforce/affordable housing while preserving, modifying, or demolishing the existing historic structure. Present were the development team (Abundant Corporation and consultants), church leadership, the Historic Architectural Review Board (HARB), and members of the public.

---

**1. Development Proposal**

**Developer / Team**

- Jeremy Keith Gizzard, Abundant Corporation (developer)
- Scott (architect)
- Jonathan Bowser (finance/development consultant)
- Union Lutheran Church leadership

**Concept Overview**

- Redevelopment of the church property into:
  - **~43 residential units / ~60 beds** of workforce/affordable housing.
  - **~9,000 sq ft of community space** dedicated back to the church for:
    - Food pantry
    - Clothing room
    - Counseling and outreach programs
  - **3,000–5,000 sq ft of commercial storefront space.**

- Goal is to maintain the church's community services on-site while adding new housing and tax-generating uses.

### **Building Conditions & Cost**

- Significant **deferred maintenance** and obsolescence:
  - Failing roof; outdated mechanical and electrical systems.
  - Non-compliant with modern accessibility (multiple levels, no ADA).
  - Custom stained glass and ornate features are costly to repair.
- Cost estimates discussed:
  - **≈ \$1.6M** in currently deferred maintenance.
  - **≈ \$6.5M** to bring the building into full code/ADA compliance.
  - **Additional \$1–2M** to make it fully functional for modern programming.
  - Projected **annual maintenance > \$100,000** if building is simply repaired as-is.
- Property currently **tax-exempt**; redevelopment could generate roughly **\$190,000+ per year in new property tax revenue** (city, school district, county).

### **Housing Affordability**

- Team intends to target households at **50–80% Area Median Income (AMI)** using:
  - PHFA programs
  - Low-Income Housing Tax Credits
  - Potential rental vouchers and other subsidies
- Exact rent levels and full capital stack are **not yet finalized**; the project remains in an early feasibility stage.

---

## **2. Church Perspective**

- Union Lutheran leadership emphasized their **primary mission is serving people**, not preserving buildings at any cost.
- Approximately **200+ individuals per day** currently receive services at the West Market Street location (meals, pantry, clothing, supports).
- The congregation has explored **multiple options over many years** (nonprofit partners, other congregations, alternative concepts); many have failed due to cost or misalignment with their mission.
- Church leaders stressed:
  - They are **not obligated** to accept this proposal.
  - If rents are not truly affordable or if community space is significantly reduced, they may **reject the project**.
  - Regardless of the building outcome, **their services will continue** in some form; “we are the church, not the structure.”

---

### 3. HARB & Preservation Concerns

- HARB members are bound by:
  - **York Design Guidelines**, and
  - **Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation**, including strict criteria on demolition.
- Key concerns:
  - **Full or substantial demolition** of a contributing historic structure in a designated district is strongly disfavored.
  - **Cost and deferred maintenance alone** are not sufficient grounds for demolition under the guidelines.
  - Historic precedent: prior attempts to demolish significant buildings for projects that never materialized have left permanent gaps in the urban fabric—motivating creation of HARB.

- Board members encouraged:
  - Treating the **historic building as the “constant”** to preserve.
  - Viewing the **program (housing model, services, configuration)** as flexible.
  - Exploring **adaptive reuse and alternative programs** (e.g., transitional housing, emergency shelter, service hub) that keep the building largely intact.

---

#### 4. Public Comment Themes

##### Preservation-Oriented:

- Multi-generation members and residents stressed the **historic and emotional significance** of the church.
- Concerning that:
  - Once demolished, the building **cannot be replaced**.
  - “Affordable housing” and private development could become a **pretext** for profit-driven demolition.
  - Other sites in the neighborhood might be better suited for new housing.

##### Neighborhood Impact:

- Some nearby residents cited current issues (litter, disruptive behavior, safety incidents) surrounding concentrated services.
- Worry about **over-concentration** of vulnerable populations and programs in a small radius.

##### Support for Redevelopment / Mission-First:

- Others emphasized that **unaddressed deterioration** risks eventual collapse or long-term vacancy.
- For some, a new, code-compliant facility that preserves services and adds housing is preferable to an empty, failing structure.

---

#### 5. Status & Next Steps

- Proposal is **preliminary and conceptual**:
    - No final funding package.
    - No final rent schedule.
    - No full demonstration that adaptive reuse (without demolition) is infeasible.
  - The development team is expected to:
    - Return to HARB with **more detailed plans**.
    - **Directly address historic guidelines** and demolition standards.
    - Further clarify the **affordability levels, funding sources, and community impacts**.
  - HARB signaled that **full demolition will face a very high bar**, and comprehensive exploration of preservation-forward alternatives will be required before any final decision.
- 

## Adjournment

Mr. Kunkle adjourned the meeting at approximately 7:37 PM.

**The next meeting 1-8-26.**

Minutes recorded by Nancy Griffin.