

**HISTORICAL AND ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW BOARD**  
**Borough of West Chester, Pennsylvania**

**Minutes**

**January 30, 2025**

**7:00 pm – Room 232 - Borough Hall**

**PRESENT:** Carol Quigley-Chair, Matthew Hazley, Joseph Martino, Marissa McCarthy, Daniel Richie, Michael Wallacavage, Philip Yocum

**ABSENT:** Thomas Clark, Thomas Dougherty

**A. Applications:**

**1. 2025-01:                    9 North High Street / 9 Prime**  
*Proposed work:*                Sign

**Findings;** The applicant, Carol Quigley, was present. Ms. Quigley described the project to install a new 18”x18” freestanding, post mounted, directional sign, with an attached wireless call button at the restaurant’s front entrance. The Pennsylvania State Accessibility Board requires the sign to allow disabled persons to call for restaurant staff to provide assistance when entering the building. When alerted, the staff will provide a temporary ramp for disabled persons to enter the building. The message on the sign will be:

- “ADA ACCESS - For Assistance Please Ring Bell”

The sign will be made of cast aluminum, painted black with gold text, mounted on a black powder coated post. Two location options were presented, Option #1 orients the sign parallel to High Street and Option #2 orients the sign perpendicular to High Street. Both sign location options are tucked within the recessed building entrance, not on the public sidewalk.

The HARB reviewed the project. The sign is well designed, appropriate, and unobtrusive when viewed from the public way. Both sign location options are acceptable.

**Motion;** Brought by Joseph Martino to recommend Approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application 2025-01 as submitted with the following clarification:

1. Sign location options #1 and #2 are both acceptable. Final location to be at the owner’s option.

**Seconded:** Michael Wallacavage

**Passed;** Yes (Unanimously)

**2. 2025-02:                    100 West Market Street / Guinta Enterprises**  
*Proposed work:*                Repair, Replacement, or Alteration from original – Entrance Door

**Findings;** The owner’s representative, Rebecca Nemeth, was present to describe the project’s scope. Ms. Nemeth explained the history of the project. The owner undertook an extensive interior renovation of the building. The only exterior work was the replacement of the existing twin corner entrance doors which was made a requirement by the Borough’s building inspector, during a site inspection. The original doors were a pair of 30-inch-wide, traditional wood doors with divided-lite glass. Ms. Nemeth indicated she was not aware of the need for HARB approval of the new exterior door, so a 36-inch-wide modern aluminum single entrance door with sidelights was purchased and installed.

The HARB reviewed the application in detail. The HARB was sorry that the inspector required replacement of the existing doors without discussing options; or explaining the requirement for HARB review of a new exterior door within the HARB District. This created a very regrettable situation. Unfortunately, the modern aluminum replacement door that was installed is inappropriate for this significant and highly visible building. The HARB members were sympathetic to the owner's situation, but unanimous in recommending denial of the application; and requiring installation of an appropriate replacement door.

The HARB discussed the design of a historically appropriate exterior door with Ms. Nemeth. The use of a single 36-inch-wide, stile & rail, wood door, (similar to the original doors that were removed) with flanking sidelights, is acceptable. The materials should be painted wood. Insulated glass with SDL (simulated divided lite) raised muntins is acceptable.

**Motion;** Brought Joseph Martino to recommend Denial of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Application 2025-50 as submitted due to the fact that the replacement door is a modern style door and frame that is not historically appropriate. The door is inappropriate because the installed door does not resemble the original painted wood door and frame, with divided lite windows, as required by the HARB Design Guidelines. The new replacement door style and materials should comply with the Design Guidelines; however, the final door and frame configuration, size, and detailing may be revised to comply with applicable building code requirements.

**Seconded;** Daniel Richie

**Passed;** Yes (Unanimously)

**3. 2025-03: 100 West Gay Street / Guinta Enterprises**  
*Proposed work:* Repair, Replacement, or Alteration from original – Entrance Door

**Findings;** The applicant's representative, Rebecca Nemeth, was present to describe the project's scope. The applicant proposes to replace the existing pair of wood entrance doors with a modern style, single aluminum door and frame. The doors are prominently located in an elaborate wood framed building entrance, located on the front corner of the building facing the intersection of Church and Gay Streets. The two existing doors are narrow, which was typical in the nineteenth century. The full door frame opening width is 50-inches. The proposed new single door is 48-inches wide.

The HARB reviewed the project and made the following comments:

- The HARB prefers an in-kind replacement of the existing narrow pair of wood doors from a historical perspective, but acknowledges this may not be practical.
- The installation of a single new door to replace the narrow wood doors is acceptable for improved functionality and ADA compliance.
- The new door should be painted wood of traditional stile and rail construction.
- The HARB recommends a tall lower rail/base panel (approximately 18-inches) to match historic entrance doors, and to improve the door's structural integrity.
- It is suggested the single door should be 42-inches wide with a 5-to-6-inch wood perimeter at the jambs and head. Infill moldings should be compatible with the existing wood design at the building entrance.
- Door hardware should be traditional style with modern functionality.
- Glazing may be a single panel of insulated glass.

Ms. Nemeth requested the application be tabled so she can consult with the property owner before proceeding. The tenant is currently renovating the first-floor restaurant, but it can reopen with the existing doors until the new door design is finalized.

**4. 2025-04: 21 West Market Street /  
Chester County Conference & Visitors Center**  
*Proposed work:* Sign

**Findings;** The applicant's designer, Steve Miller, was present to present the project. Mr. Miller explained he is appearing before HARB for a preliminary review of their general signage concepts. The Chester County Conference and Visitor's Center is in the process of relocating from Kennett Square to a space under renovation in the Historic Chester County Courthouse. The applicant would like to erect an exterior sign near the Market Street entrance to the building. Mr. Miller presented photos of the existing site and three conceptual sign designs for discussion.

The HARB reviewed the conceptual sign designs with the following comments:

- The existing District Court sign is located near the proposed new sign, they seem to conflict. Could the two signs be combined into one new sign?
- The proposed sign is shown as single sided, facing west on an angle. Would it be advantageous to install a new double-sided sign, perpendicular to Market Street, which would also be visible from High Street?
- The proposed 2' x 7' sign size was deemed appropriate, could possibly be larger.
- The HARB was split on their graphic preference of the three proposed signs. Signs #2 and #3 received the most support.
- The modern style sign mounted on two posts was not enthusiastically endorsed.
- Mr. Wallacavage would prefer a sign with more historic character.
- Mr. Hazley suggested that a serpentine stone base or side pillars might be appropriate. Mr. Yocum commented a masonry structure might be too heavy.
- The HARB expressed concern of impacts on the existing tree roots.
- Mr. Miller indicated the sign would not be illuminated, internally or externally.

Mr. Miller thanked the HARB for their input and requested the application be tabled so he can consult with the applicant before proceeding with the final sign design.

**5. 2024-50: 121 East Market Street / Sharlee K. Van Tine**  
*Proposed work:* Window Replacement

**Findings;** The building owner and applicant, Sharlee Van Tine, was present. Ms. Van Tine reviewed the proposed project as follows:

- She would like to replace the six existing front windows above the first -floor storefront (3 each at the second and third floors).
- The existing 1-over-1, double-hung windows are vinyl and in poor condition.
- The proposed new windows are 6-over-6, double-hung, vinyl units by Chapman.
- The applicant stated the third floor, east window is located in a bath/shower, and it is not practical to install a wood window in that location.
- The upper-floor tenants are not always careful to cover the shower window.

The HARB reviewed the project and made the following comments:

- The HARB will only recommend wood windows for this replacement.
- All six windows must match; Double-hung 2-over-2 and 6-over-6 configurations were preferred as most appropriate.
- Mr. Richie recommended a separate interior window covering behind the exterior window in the shower, and he displayed an example from Pinterest.
- Reconfiguring the interior wall of the shower was discussed.

- Reconfiguring the bathroom may be the best long-term option.

Ms. Van Tine requested the application be tabled to allow her time to review her options before proceeding further.

**B. Announcement of New a HARB Member:** Carol Quigley introduced and welcomed a new member to the HARB, Marissa McCarthy. Ms. McCarthy's new term started in January 2025; she was in attendance and participated in the January HARB meeting. The other HARB members introduced themselves and enthusiastically welcomed Ms. McCarthy to the board.

**C. Annual HARB Reorganization:** Carol Quigley opened the selection of the 2025 HARB Chair and Vice-Chair. Ms. Quigley (Chair) and Mr. Martino (Vice-Chair) were placed in nomination. Both accepted their nominations.

**Motion;** Brought by Mr. Wallacavage to nominate Carol Quigley as HARB Chair.

**Seconded;** Mr. Yocum

**Passed;** Yes (Unanimously)

**Motion;** Brought by Mr. Yocum to nominate Joseph Martino as HARB Vice-Chair.

**Seconded;** Mr. Wallacavage

**Passed;** Yes (Unanimously)

**D. Report from Planning Commission;** The Planning Commission liaison provided the following project updates:

1. No Report for March

**E. Approval of the December 2024 meeting minutes**

**Motion;** Brought by Matthew Hazley to recommend approval of the December 2024, meeting minutes.

**Seconded;** Daniel Richie

**Passed;** Yes (Unanimously)

**E. Other Business;**

1. No other business.

**Motion to adjourn;** by Daniel Richie

**Seconded;** by Matthew Hazley

**Passed;** Yes (Unanimously)

January 2025 HARB minutes submitted by: Philip Yocum