



repairing the windows. The site visit made on 1/19/09 showed that, while the sashes were generally in good shape, the design of the window does not feature sash weights and racking of the building has caused some out of square thereby contributing to the leakage and lack of ease of operation problems in their present location. Some of the trim was missing. It was noted that there are currently old aluminum triple track storm windows on the openings.

Mr. Leshner had obtained a copy of the 1901 Sanborn Insurance Map which showed the rear addition in place at that time. The building is “contributing”. This information, coupled with the window design and construction, makes it likely that the windows are original to the addition.

The applicant cited reasons supporting her desire to replace the windows in question rather than repair them. New windows will preclude the need for storm windows.

Two members of the public spoke in support of the proposal.

Some members of the Commission were concerned that raising the original windows (not at issue here since it was previously approved) would cause much of the fabric of the complete window to be lost. Other issues were also discussed by the Commission.

The applicant agreed to sell or donate the old windows to a historic salvage facility.

The Commission does not deviate from its adherence to the Guidelines expressed on pg 51, R1 which call for repair of historic windows rather than replacement. But, in this very narrow case, it feels that the guideline on pg 51, R2 is more appropriate to the circumstance. Here the Commission had previously agreed to raising the windows to accommodate the desired porch roof slope which was an integral part of the original complete project.

This revision (involving replacement of five windows) to the original 10/27/09 approval is approved as submitted since the Commission had already approved raising the windows and it was felt that much of the historic window fabric would be lost. This approval is in no way to be considered precedent setting for any other application or change to a previous approval.

**Approved As Submitted and noted above** – Motion by Gill, passed 6-1, Sener dissenting.

### **Consent Docket Items**

- none

### **Items from the Commission**

- The changes to the Procedures as a result of the MAHDC recommendations were accepted, 7-0.
- The revised Application and Agenda forms were approved.
- Enforcement concepts were discussed.
- Lobby Day for Historic Districts and Historic Museums in Annapolis will be 2/12/09.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger A. Bollman  
Chairman

cc: Zach Smith