



York Historical Architectural Review Board Meeting Minutes

September 10, 2026, | 101 S George St, York PA 17401

MEMBERS PRESENT	MEMBERS ABSENT	STAFF PRESENT
Dennis Kunkle, Chair	Sarah O'Brien	Nancy Griffin
Mark Shermeyer	Blake Gifford	Becky Zeller
Mark Skehan	Lauren Mclane-Gross	
Craig Zumbrun, Vice Chair		
Carlos Santiago		

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION	ACTION/RESULT
Welcome and call to order.		Mr. Kunkle called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM.
Changes to the agenda		No Changes.
Minutes of previous meeting		Mr. Skehan made a motion to accept Mr. Shermeyer 2nd. Unanimous.
Cases	The following case was considered as described below.	

Case #1 – 232 N. GEORGE ST.

**REPLACEMENT OF FIVE SINGLE-HUNG WOOD WINDOWS ON
FRONT OF BUILDING WITH FIBREX COMPOSITE WINDOWS.**

Discussion:

The applicant proposed replacing five windows on the front façade of the building. The proposed windows would be constructed of composite/polymer material intended to closely resemble wood.

The applicant noted that similar replacement windows had previously been installed at 230 North George Street, on the third floor, and that those windows were designed to closely replicate the original window assemblies.

The Board's primary concern was the relationship between the proposed replacement windows and the remaining historic windows.

Of the five window units in the affected area, approximately half of the existing units would remain. Members expressed concern that the proposed operable windows, including the proposed sash and meeting-rail configuration, could appear substantially different from the original windows immediately adjacent to them.

The Board specifically requested a detailed section showing:

- The proposed window construction;
- The meeting rail between the upper and lower portions;
- The relationship between the individual window units;
- The jamb, sash, and other relevant details; and
- A comparison between the existing and proposed conditions.

The Board noted that the building's façade is particularly intact and has been carefully restored. Members therefore felt that the replacement work should be compatible with the existing historic windows.

Possible alternatives discussed included:

1. Repairing the existing windows rather than replacing them;
2. Replacing all five window units so that they would match;
3. Providing additional detailing demonstrates that the proposed replacement windows would adequately match the existing historic windows.

Next Steps: Applicant will provide the requested information or revise the scope of work. The new details or scope of work will be presented at a future meeting for approval.

Action:

Mr. Shermeyer moved to table pending submission of additional window details and consideration of alternative solutions as discussed. Mr. Zumbrun 2nd. Motion carried unanimously.

Case #2 – 215-217 S. GEORGE ST

REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING DOOR IN PEDESTRIAN ALLEY AND CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW DOOR OPENING IN THE NORTH WALL OF THE BUILDING FACING COURT AVE.

Discussion:

The applicant presented the proposed improvements.

The Board discussed the visibility of the proposed work from public areas and the fact that the work would primarily be visible from service alleys rather than the principal street frontage.

The applicant clarified that the entire door frame in the pedestrian alley would be replaced, not just the door leaf.

Next Steps:

The Certificate of Appropriateness will be presented at the City Council Meeting on 9/15/26.

Action:

Mr. Zumbrun made a motion to accept as submitted, Mr. Shermeyer 2nd, primarily because the proposed work would not be readily visible from the public way. Motion carried unanimously.

Case #3 – 117 N. NEWBERRY ST

REPLACEMENT OF NON-HISTORIC PORCH WITH A NEW WOOD PORCH.

Discussion:

The existing porch was described as a later, non-historic porch. The proposed replacement would maintain generally the same dimensions, without the angled corner. The steps will include a handrail on both side. The steps and railings will be painted.

The Board agreed that the proposed porch would replace an existing non-historic porch and would retain the general scale and dimensions of the existing structure.

Next Steps:

The Certificate of Appropriateness will be presented at the City Council Meeting on 9/15/26.

Action:

Mr. Shermeyer made a motion to approve the application as submitted, Mr. Skehan 2nd. Motion carried unanimously.

Case #4 – 243-245 W. MARKET ST.

CONSTRUCTION OF TWO-STORY REAR ADDITION.

Discussion:

The applicant presented the proposed project, which includes a two-story rear addition. There will be no work on the front of the building.

The Board discussed the proposed window material and configuration.

The applicant initially identified the proposed windows as a PVC/uPVC product. The Board noted that uPVC is essentially a type of vinyl and expressed a preference for a composite material or another material more appropriate to the historic district.

The Board also discussed window configuration. Existing windows on historic portions of the building have a one-over-one appearance. The proposed sliding vinyl windows are not appropriate for the historic district.

The Board requested that the windows on the addition replicate the one over one configuration of the windows on the rest of the building. The windows do not need to be operable. They could be a fixed or casement window with a simulated division. The windows should be a composite or aluminum clad material rather than uPVC or other vinyl product.

The Board also reviewed the proposed metal siding on the rear addition.

Members noted that contemporary metal siding has been used on other additions within the historic district and that the proposed addition is located toward the rear of the property and does not exceed the height of the existing building.

The Board generally found the scale and location of the addition acceptable. The proposed metal siding was considered appropriate in the context of the rear addition, provided the overall treatment remained subordinate to the historic building.

Next Steps:

The applicant will need to submit revised window plans to the consultant for approval prior to installation. The Certificate of Appropriateness will be presented at the City Council Meeting on 9/15/26.

Action:

Mr. Shermeyer made a motion to approve the application subject to revisions to the windows, specifically:

- Revising the window configuration to provide a one over one appearance, either through operable one-over-one windows, simulated divided lights, or another historically appropriate configuration;
- Using composite material or another approved material rather than uPVC/vinyl; and
- Submitting the revised window information to the consultant for review, Mr. Zumbrun2nd. The motion carried unanimously.

Case #5 – 823 S. GEORGE ST.

REPLACEMENT OF ASBESTOS TILE ROOF WITH ASPHALT SHINGLES.

Discussion:

The applicant presented proposed roof replacement.

The Board indicated that an open valley treatment would generally be more historically appropriate than enclosing the valley and that the proposed approach appeared compatible with the building.

The applicant stated that any damaged face boards would be replaced with wood 1x6s and painted. The board noted that a composite material would also be acceptable, but wrapping the face boards in aluminum would not.

Next Steps:

The Certificate of Appropriateness will be presented at the City Council Meeting on 9/15/26.

Action:

Mr. Skehan made a motion to approve the application with the condition that the valleys be open, with a dark metal base, and that any damaged face boards are replaced in-kind or with a composite material. Mr. Zumbrun 2nd. The motion carried unanimously.

Case #6 – 121 W. SPRINGETTSBURY AVE.

REPLACEMENT OF REAR GARAGE ASBESTOS SHINGLE ROOF WITH ASPHALT SHINGLES.

Discussion:

The applicant explained that a tree branch had fallen through the garage roof, creating an insurance-related need to complete the repairs and roof replacement.

The applicant discussed two potential roofing materials:

- Asphalt shingles; or
- Standing-seam metal roofing.

The Board discussed whether a standing-seam metal roof would be historically appropriate for the garage. The consultant indicated that the appropriateness of metal would depend in part on the age and historic character of the garage and whether metal roofing would have been a historically appropriate material for that period. Members noted that asphalt shingles would clearly read as a modern replacement rather than an attempt to replicate a historic material. Standing-seam metal would also be visually appropriate.

The applicant indicated a preference for standing-seam metal.

Next Steps:

The Certificate of Appropriateness will be presented at the City Council Meeting on 9/15/26.

Action:

Mr. Shermeyer made a motion to approve the application with the roofing material to be standing-seam metal or asphalt shingles, Mr. Zumbrun 2nd. Motion carried unanimously.

Administrative Approvals

28 E Market St (York City Admin Building) – Exempt – Mechanical upgrades will not be visible from the public right-of-way.

No Board action was required.

Other Business/Public Comment

An opportunity for public comment was provided. No public comment was recorded.

Adjournment

Mr. Kunkle adjourned the meeting at approximately 6:37 PM.

The next meeting 9-24-26

Minutes recorded by Nancy Griffin.