

Easton Historic District Commission
Easton, Maryland
April 27, 2009

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

Absent: Pete Leshner.

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

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved as written.

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. 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 6-0.

Consent Docket Approvals

22-2009 100 Glenwood Ave – Re-roof Like and Same

Business:

17-2009 127 Goldsborough St Elizabeth Benitz, Owner.

The applicant did not appear. No action was taken since the application had been tabled on 4/13/09.

**50-2004 113 Talbot St. Brendan O’Neal, Adam Theeke,
Contractors.**

This is an amendment to the approval of 4/13/09. Mr. O’Neal requested that he be allowed to install his fence along the east side of the property without getting the neighbor’s approval to remove his existing fence. This amendment does not materially change the 4/13/09 approval.

Approved as noted above – Motion by DeLaurentis, passed 6-0.

20-2009 216 S. Hanson St. Rhonda Thomson, Owner.

This application covers a wooden picket fence in the rear yard. It meets the Guidelines on pg 32, R3&4.

Approved as Submitted – Motion by Gill, passed 6-0.

23-2009 15A N. Harrison St. Gregory Frankos, Tenant.

The application covers a business (signboard) sign at this address. It was clarified that it will be:

- Professionally made
- Of either MDF or MDO material
- Computer generated logo/lettering/background
- Little or no edge treatment
- No lighting
- Colors as described.

The application meets the Guidelines on pg 66, R1, 2, 3.

Approved As Submitted – Motion by Herrmann, passed 6-0.

21-2009 11 S. Aurora St. Lauren Dianich, Architect.

This application was postponed at the applicant’s request. No action was taken.

24-2009 102 E. Dover St. Andy Smith (O.N. Andrew & Son).

This is a new application replacing 8-2009 that had been denied. After general discussion, it was agreed that the application be tabled since it was incomplete (no cut sheet on the proposed wood shutters, no documentation of the condition of existing wood shutters). Mr. Smith will endeavor to have an owner at the next meeting.

Tabled – Motion by DeLaurentis, passed 6-0

29-2009 408 August St. Mary Gibson, Owner.

This application was intended to be a discussion of the siding options for this property. It became apparent that no meaningful discussion was possible until the present cedar shingle siding was removed so that the condition of the original wood siding underneath could be ascertained. Accordingly, it was agreed that the present inappropriate shingles (cedar shingles and under layment) could be removed to permit the process of discovery to proceed. It meets the Guidelines on pg44, R4.

After removal and evaluation of the original siding, the owner will return to the Commission with a new application for the proposed siding treatment.

Approved as noted above – Motion by Herrmann, passed 6-0.

Items from the Commission

- Members of the Commission who attended the professional training “Camp” in Cambridge put on by the National Alliance of Preservation Commissions reported out.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger A. Bollman
Chairman

cc: Zach Smith