

Easton Historic District Commission
Easton, Maryland
January 9, 2012

Members Present: Roger Bollman, Chairman, Adam Theeke, John Sener, Kurt Herrmann, Mark Beck, Lena Gill, and Janet Gregor.

Members Absent: Adam Theeke.

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 for the evening was accepted 7-0.

Consent Docket Approval – None.

Staff Approval – None.

Business:

58-2011 210 S. Harrison Street Christine Dayton, Architect.

The HDC approval of this application was appealed to the Board of Zoning Appeals. BOZA remanded it back to the HDC for further consideration. This hearing was in response to that remand.

The removal of the trees in dispute has already occurred and construction of the larger project has begun. The details of the application were reviewed. It was agreed that, at the first HDC

meeting in April, the applicant will present a landscaping plan for the property that will include utilities and geothermal wells. By mutual consent between the applicant and the HDC, this application will be *continued* until after the first April meeting and allow the Commission to act. The 45 day rule will not be invoked.

Continued – Motion by Gill, passed 6-0, Bollman recused.

1-2012 20 Thorogood Lane Chris Bernath, Owner.

This application covers the removal of the chimney at the rear of the building that has already been substantially renovated. A new rear addition will replace a former addition that was removed.

Formerly, the chimney was internal to the building on the first floor and external on the 2nd floor. It is not now functional and will not be and, is not easily seen from Thorogood Street. However, it can be seen across a currently vacant lot from Aurora St. and South St..

After discussion, the Commission approved the application as submitted. The chimney's originality was questioned and it was not deemed an essential feature of the building hence the Guidelines on 56 R2 and 57 NR3 do not apply.

Approved as Submitted – Motion by Beck, passed 5-2, Sener and Herrmann dissenting.

84-2011 24 N. Aurora Street H.L. Hosford, Jr., Owner.

This application covers final removal (currently the siding has been removed) of the shed attachment on the north side of the barn at the rear of the property. A photograph of the barn/shed from the 2004 Survey was reviewed and is made part of the file. Two photos taken of the current condition on 1/5/12 were also reviewed and are made part of the file.

As part of the application, Mr. Hosford had submitted a drawing, dated 12/9/11, that showed his plans for the shed. His plan is to demolish the remaining part of the shed and rebuild it per the drawing. This will be revised to show barn doors with strap hinges on the east side as shown in the 2004 photo. The application was discussed.

The HDC noted the following:

- The roof pitches on the barn and shed do not appear to be the same in the 2004 photo. These must be verified and shown correctly on the drawing.
- The material for the proposed door and window must be all wood.
- The location of the door and window should match evidence of original openings.
- The Commission questioned the need to remove the existing shed roof, arguing in favor of preserving existing fabric if possible. A site visit regarding this item will be made.

The Commission will make a site visit to the property on Friday, 1/13, at 8:30 am to further consider the application.

Mr. Hosford knows that revisions in his application/drawing that address the above concerns will be necessary.

Continued – motion by Gregor, passed 7-0.

85-2012 33-35 West St. Jay Corvan, Architect.

This application covers the demolition of a concrete block shed at the rear of the non-contributing building. This meets the corollary of the Guideline on 35 NR1 and the Zoning Ordinance 701.E.2.d and is approved as submitted.

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

Discussion **1 E. Dover St** **Charles Goebel, Architect; David Valliant,**
Owner.

This discussion was intended to introduce the Commission to the new owner's probable plans for the exterior of the building. These are show on Goebel drawings H01- H04, dated 1/9/12.

The Commission is gratified to see needed investment in this very prominent historic building in the center of Easton. It was noted however, that the replacement of the 2nd and 3rd floor windows will involve much difficult discussion as these are likely original fabric.

A site visit will be made on Friday, 1/20, at 8:30 am.

1-2012 **404 South Street** **Don Johnson, Representative for Nelson Poe,**
Owner.

This application covers the replacement of a crumbling brick pier with a proper concrete block foundation at the rear addition to the house. The east portion of the foundation is not in question and is concrete. A photo taken 1/5/12 shows the area in question and is part of the record. While the building is contributing, the proposed modification cannot be seen from the public right of way and will be consistent with the existing concrete foundation. The applicant agreed to parge the new cement block foundation to improve its appearance.

Additionally, the applicant may rebuild/repair the existing brick rear steps as needed.

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

At the conclusion of this application, Mr. Johnson asked to discuss several items:

1. Rebuild/replacement of windows – A window schedule for the plans for all windows is needed. Cut sheets for replacement windows are required. Wood replacements are preferred.
2. Re-roof with architectural shingles – This is normally approved.
3. Remove the rear window – Seems reasonable but must be in an application.

3-2012 **220 S. Aurora St.** **William Boyle, Representative for Bee Green Land Co.,**
LLC.

This application covers the permanent removal of the front roof dormer. It has already been removed without approval and any field verification was impossible. The second part is to remove the existing wood fascia around the roof and replace it with PVC material.

The applicant says that the dormer was sitting on top of 4 layers of shingles and that the shingled roof projected 1' to 11/2' into the dormer opening in the roof. Further, the dormer was just nailed to the roof and about to fall off. From these observations, he concludes that the dormer is of the vintage of the last layer of shingles and therefore not original fabric. (The house dates from 1910 and is contributing.) Photos of the building with and without this dormer are included in the file. A majority of the Commission agreed with his analysis that the dormer was a rather recent feature and did not fall under Guideline 55R1 or 57NR3.

Approved (dormer removal) as Submitted – Motion by Gregor, passed 4-3, Bollman, Herrman, Theeke dissenting.

Use of PVC material for any portion of the fascia is inappropriate; it must be wood. At the meeting, it was agreed that, if the fascia needs padding out to meet the drip edge, wood material will be used. This is supported by the Guidelines 56R1.

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

Items from the Commission

- Roger Bollman was elected Chairman; Kurt Herrmann was elected Vice Chairman
- A Maryland Association of Historic District Commissions half day training workshop will be held on a Saturday in April 2012.
- The Commission adopted the recommendation by the Town Attorney that the sentence “The Historic District Commission reserves the right to modify, alter, or change proposals set forth in the applications” be added to the bottom of the agenda.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger A. Bollman, Chairman
Historic District Commission

cc: Zach Smith