

**Easton Historic District Commission
Easton, Maryland
June 14, 2010**

Members Present: Roger Bollman, Chairman, Joyce DeLaurentis, Kurt Herrmann, Mac Brittingham, John Sener, Lena Gill, and Mark Beck.

Mr. Bollman called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

Opening statement given by the Chairman.

The Commission operates under the authority granted to it by section 701 of the Town of Easton Zoning Ordinance. And, I hereby open the record of the public hearing on cases heard this evening and, in accordance with our legal responsibilities, I enter into the record the following items: notice of the public hearing, adopted design guidelines, resumes of commission members and any consultants used by the Commission, records of any previous meetings, and any letters to the Commission on a case.

The decisions of the HDC may be appealed within 30 days of approval.

General Order of the hearing of Applications

- *Introduction of the application by the presiding officer*
- *Presentation by the applicant or his agent*
- *Questions by members of the Commission*
- *Public comment*
- *Petitioner rebuttal*
- *Discussion and consideration by the Commission*
- *Decision motion and statement of Basis for Decision*
- *The applicant may withdraw the application at any time up to when the vote is taken*

A Certificate of Appropriateness shall lapse upon the expiration of the corresponding Building Permit. For applications that require a building permit but for which none is issued, this Certificate of Appropriateness shall lapse six (6) months after its issuance. In the event a building permit is not required, the Certificate of Appropriateness shall lapse six (6) months from its issuance if substantial work is not underway. For good cause shown, this period may be extended by the Commission.

I will now entertain a motion to accept the agenda for this evening.

The agenda as amended for the evening was accepted 7-0.

Consent Docket Approvals

None

Staff Approvals

35-2010 11 N. Aurora St --- re-roof like and same

36-2010 206 S. Aurora St – re-roof like and same

Business:

29-2010 305 North St. Noah Matten, Owner.

This applicant has been revised the application to cover major repairs to a one story kitchen addition; also repair of various components (wood) in the front porch.

It was agreed that:

- New kitchen windows will be: 6/6, same size, wood exterior and interior, SDL
- New kitchen door will be: wood, #501 Artisan (single glass lite and single solid panel)
- New kitchen roof will be: standing seam metal, 1” max rib height, 12” rib spacing
- Kitchen replacement siding as needed will be: wood (not Hardi-plank)
- Any repair components to the front porch will be wood

This application meets the Guidelines 44 R2,48 R1 & R2, 51 R1&R2&R4, 58 R1&R2&R3

Approved as noted above – Motion by Herrmann, passed 7-0.

78-2009 304 S. Hanson St. Patti Godlee, Owner.

This application covers a modification to a previously approved screen porch at the rear of the building. The modification (shown on marked up sketch dated 6/14/10) is to extend the porch to the south some five feet. As a result of the extension the standing seam roof will require a hip seam. It was agreed that this will be a crimped seam, not have the standard “cap” found on most modern metal roofs.

Approved as noted above – Motion by DeLaurentis, passed 7-0.

34-2010 416 Goldsborough St. Peter Johnston, Owner.

This application covers: siding repairs to the east façade of the rear addition on the building, replacement of the northernmost of the two windows on the east façade of the rear addition, replacement of the door on the east façade of the rear addition and scraping/painting the east façade of the main block of the building.

The project was described as:

1. siding repairs on rear addition – siding (all wood) will be repaired or selectively replaced (wood)
2. window on rear addition – a reconditioned, wood, TDL, window that is identical to the existing window and the southernmost window is already on site; this will be used to replace the defective window
3. door on rear addition – a security issue and the perceived condition of the existing door has led the applicant to purchase the door (not installed yet) noted in the application; this door unit is 3’-0” vs 2’-6” and will require widening the opening; the present trim will be retained.
4. main block siding – This siding will be scrapped and painted (not replaced, repaired & selective replacement, wood – like and same).

The application meets the Guidelines on pg 44 R17R2, 51 R2.

Approved as noted above – Motion by Gill, passed 4-3, Bollman, Herrmann, Sener dissenting.

Housing Coalition of Talbot County Barbara Heatly.

Ms. Heatly requested that her presentation be postponed until the first meeting in July.

37-2010 210 S. Harrison St. Christine Dayton, Architect.

This application covers a new screen porch to be built along the north façade at the rear of the building, replacement of an existing window with a sliding French door and, relocation of the patio. All work is shown on: Dayton drawings EX 1, 2, and 3; A 1, 2, 3 dated 5/25/10; Waters site plan dated 6/8/10.

The application meeting the spirit of the Guidelines on pg 81 and details of scale, mass, height, and roof shape.

Approved as Submitted – Motion by Brittingham, passed 7-0.

31-2010 113 N. Washington St./106&108 West St. Christine Dayton, Architect; Nick Cappella, Architect; Bruce Armistead, Attorney.

This application covers repairs to the front of the building at 113, demolition of the rear of 113 and the rear main roof dormers, demolition of 106 and 108; and construction of a new replacement building.

The portion of the application covering the repair of the damage to the storefront at 113 N. Washington St is complete and can stand alone per agreement between Ms. Dayton and the HDC.

Alternatively, the portions of the application covering: demolition of the rear of 113 N. Washington and the two dormers on the main block rear roof, demolition of 106 West St., demolition of 108 West St., and construction of a new building at 106, 108, and on the rear of 113 are interrelated and still incomplete (no revisions to the original submittal have been put forth). *As such, these portions remain tabled.*

113 N. Washington – storefront portion only

This portion is a major repair to the storefront (east façade) of the building at this address occasioned by a recent auto accident. They are shown on Dayton drawings CEM 113 N. Washington A1, A2, D1, D2, D3 dated 2/12/10.

The facts covering this portion are:

- store front was damaged by an auto accident
- this is essentially a major repair
- Applicant intends to restore storefront to pre-accident condition (design & materials)
- Applicant may do other needed internal repairs that will prolong the life of this significant building (see GMB report, dated 5/6/10)
- Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS)
 - Significant architecture
 - Fine early example

The intentions of the applicant were discussed. It is felt that this portion complies with the Guidelines on pg 61 R1.

Approved as Submitted (storefront portion only) – Motion by Gill, passed 7-0.

Demolition of 113 rear & dormers, 106, 108; new building

These interrelated components of application and must be treated together.

It was noted that the HDC will rely on the Guidelines, the Secretary of Interior's Standards, the Easton Zoning Ordinance (Sec 701A & E) and its Procedures for guidance in making its decision.

No revision to the original submission has been submitted to date.

Each component was discussed in depth. At the request of Ms. Dayton, a non-binding straw pole of the HDC was taken on each component so that she could sense the feeling of the HDC toward the various components.

Ms. Dayton noted that since the first meeting she has become more aware of the health concerns regarding “mold” issues at 108. It was suggested that she might follow up with a professional analysis of the magnitude of the possible problem.

The following are some of the concerns expressed by some members of the HDC:

- That the demolitions will occur quickly with no assurance that an approved replacement building will be built (Mr. Armistead stated that the owner would be willing to give some form of surety to guarantee prompt new construction.).
- The demolitions at 108 and 113 will destroy historic fabric.
- The roof on the new building is too prominent and too uniform.
- The West St. facades of the new building may be too high or could possibly be revised.
- The connection of the new building to the rear of the main block of 113 is not sympathetic to the historic building.

Ms. Dayton requested to be on the first July agenda to present her response to HDC concerns.

These portions (demo 113 rear & dormers, demo 106, demo 108, new building) of the application are incomplete and remain *tabled* from the 5/24/10 meeting.

23-2010 523 Goldsborough St. Kurt Herrmann, Contractor.

The owner of the property has requested a slight modification (shift a window location about 3’) to a previously approved application.

Approved as Submitted – Motion by Sener, passed 6-0, Herrmann recused.

Items from the Commission

None

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger A. Bollman, Chairman
Historic District Commission

cc: Zach Smith