

# MINUTES

## **Easton Historic District Commission Easton, Maryland**

**April 9, 2013**

**Members Present:** Kurt Herrmann, Chairman, Lena Gill Mark Beck, Robert Arnouts and George Koste.

**Absent:** Adam Theeke.

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

The minutes of the March 11<sup>th</sup> & March 25<sup>th</sup> 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 April 9, 2013 meeting was approved (5-0).

**Consent Docket Approvals - None**

**Staff Approvals – None**

## **OLD BUSINESS:**

**16-2013**

**5 E. Earle Avenue**

**Lauren Dianich, Agent.**

The applicant was before the Commission at their March 25<sup>th</sup> meeting, due to the sign not being posted on the property the Commission could not vote on the application. The Commission did, however hear the application and tabled the vote until the next meeting.

Mrs. Dianich explained the owner would like to make alterations to the existing granny flat. They are proposing to remove the entire floor of the existing granny flat and raise the bearing approximately 2'-6". A new shed dormer would be added to the north and south roof face of the new roof. The new height would be approximately 21'-0". A connecting roof will join the old and new roof. Replacement windows and doors are proposed on the north, west, and south facades. Materials would match existing materials exactly (real cedar shingles, PVC rake and fascia, and PVC raised panel horizontal trim). The new roof is lower than the main house roof and lower than the neighboring roof of the residences on the west and east. The Commission asked Mrs. Dianich to provide additional information on the elevations, existing conditions and cut sheet of proposed windows/doors.

At the April 9<sup>th</sup> meeting the applicant has returned and the property has been posted as required. Mrs. Dianich provided the Commission with an Elevation Drawing (Atelier 11 Drawing A2.2), Existing Conditions Drawing (RD1.0), and cut sheet on proposed windows and doors (Marvin) to clarify concerns from the previous meeting.

Upon motion of Mrs. Gill, seconded by Mr. Arnouts, the Commission voted 5-0 to approve the project as presented and as show on drawings as noted above. The structure is non-contributing with an auxiliary structure that is also non-contributing.

The application meets the Guidelines on Page 34, R 1.

## **NEW BUSINESS:**

**18-2013**

**21 N. Harrison Street**

**Crabi Gras.**

The applicant was not present at the meeting, but the Commission felt they had enough information to review. Proposed sign would be wood (10 square feet) placed over storefront with the store name.

Upon motion of Mr. Arnouts, seconded by Mr. Beck the Commission voted 5-0 to approve the sign as submitted.

The application meets the Guidelines on Page 66 R 1, R 2, and R 3.

**21-2013**

**106 N. West Street**

**Christine Dayton, Architect.**

The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing structure. Mrs. Dayton explained that upon inspection of the exterior walls a large bulge was discovered on the north bearing wall of the building. The change in grade from front to back and the multi-levels within the building pose problems in ADA compliance. They are proposing a new brick veneer one-story structure with a standing seam metal roof, clad windows, clad window trim, PVC building trim and cementitious siding that is in scale and proportion to the neighboring building and other buildings on this block.

The new structure will be at or near the level of the adjacent sidewalk resulting in an ADA accessible building. The availability of adjacent public parking on West Street lends to easy public access and ADA accessibility. Mrs. Dayton stated that a structural report is on file for said property. The Commission felt the application as presented was appropriate and would be a great project. It was noted that the building is non-contributing and was approved for demolition a few years ago.

The Commission upon motion of Mrs. Gill, seconded by Mr. Arnouts voted 5-0 to approve the new design for a restaurant. *The Commission did not vote on the demolition as a second hearing is required. The demolition portion of the application will be voted on at the next meeting.*

The application meets the Guidelines.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:15 p.m. by motion of Mr. Beck seconded by Mr. Arnouts.

Respectfully submitted,

Stacie S. Rice  
Planning Secretary