

Easton Historic District Commission
Easton, Maryland
August 23, 2010

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

Absent: Joyce DeLaurentis.

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 revised agenda for the evening was accepted 6-0.

Consent Docket Approvals

None

Staff Approvals

None

Business:

55-2010 4 Brookletts Ave. Daniel Arnold, Contractor.

This (2nd hearing) application covers installation of a new landing, steps, and railings at this address. A dimensioned sketch was furnished and a photo was available.

The application meets the Guidelines on pg 59 NR3.

Approved as Submitted –Motion by Brittingham, passed 6-0

56-2010 625 Goldsborough St. Michael Bibb, Tenant.

This application covers a 6' wood stockade fence near the front plane of this building and spanning the opening between 625 and 629. The fence was installed without approval and resulted in a Historic District Notice. As currently installed, it is not compatible with the property or the streetscape and is in violation of the Guidelines.

Mr. Bibb resides in the house and built the fence. The property is currently owned by a bank.

Mr. Bibb asked that the application be tabled so that he could propose changes that would make it more acceptable.

Tabled because the application is incomplete – Motion by Herrmann, passed 6-0.

59-2010 111 E. Dover St. Andy Smith, Contractor.

This application covers a new vinyl membrane roof for the upper left side flat roof, a replacement wood window (detailed in the cut sheet) for the window facing this roof, and siding repairs in the area damaged by water.

The application meets the Guidelines on pg 55 R3 and pg 51 R2 & R4.

Approved as Submitted – Motion by Herrmann, passed 5-0, Brittingham recused.

58-2010 110 S. Hanson St. Christine Dayton, Architect.

This application covers a new addition and landscaping at the Bethel AME Church. It is “concept” proposal at this point and therefore lacks the details needed for HDC action.

One letter from the public was received (and discussed) and two members of the public spoke.

The concept is shown on Lane Engineering drawing R101, dated 6/15/10, and Dayton drawings EX1, P3 and A1, dated 6/9/10. All members of the Commission were generally supportive of the concept but the following observations were made:

- Consideration should be given to revising the parapet on the Fellowship Hall to reduce its apparent mass and to further retain the south façade of the old building.
- Consideration should be given to using a “rain garden” for storm water management rather than a pond.
- Consideration can be given to making a more modern look on the west façade of the Fellowship Hall to both minimize its presence and to distinguish it from the old church to the north and the new Sanctuary to the south.
- There was some discussion of the pro & cons of moving the Fellowship Hall back some.
- The setback of the new Sanctuary was acceptable as shown.
- Mr. Gale (church member) advised that there would likely be a short hard apron off Thorogood to the parking area.
- There was discussion about improving the appearance of the gable end of the new Sanctuary (west façade) above the windows.
- The location of the HVAC units will be shown on a future drawing.
- More landscaping details will be shown on a future drawing.

- The streetscape for the east side of this block will be presented at a future meeting.

Tabled because the application is incomplete – Motion by Gill, passed 6-0.

31-2010 113 N. Washington St./106 & 108 West St. Christine Dayton, Architect.

This is the 3rd hearing of this complex application involving demolition of existing structures and construction of a new building. This hearing was devoted entirely to the conceptual changes made to the proposed new building's architecture as a result of the HDC comments at the previous meeting (No demolition can occur until a replacement building is approved). The new conceptual proposal is shown on Dayton drawings A1 & A2, dated 8/9/10.

Roger Bollman made introductory remarks that were also given at the previous meeting, reviewed key comments from the previous meeting, and reviewed the previous positions of the HDC members. One letter to the Commission from the public was read into the record.

The following significant items are unchanged:

- 106 & 108 West St. must be demolished to because they are incompatible with the new building.
- The footprint.

The following significant items are changed since the previous meeting:

- The long (255') monolithic roof has now been broken into three parts.
- The West St. façade for 106 & 108 has been substantially changed.
- The rear dormers on the 113 main block roof are retained.
- The manner in which the new building joins to the old 113 roof is now below the dormers and more sympathetic.
- The north wall of the "El" on 113 will be retained if possible with the openings bricked up.
- The south façade of the proposed new 106 building reads as two story.

All members felt that the new proposal improved the earlier proposal substantially and was moving in the right direction. The following critiques were made:

- More details on exactly how the new roof will join (and appear) to the old 113 main block roof are needed.
- The south façade at 106 looks massive. Can this appearance be mitigated somehow?
- Can the parapets on 106 & 108 be lowered or eliminated? This would have the positive effect of lowering the appearance of the buildings and their perceived mass.

The new proposal and the critiques were discussed at length. Ms. Dayton used a virtual display to explain the project. The application was tabled since the concept is still under development and therefore many dimensions/details are incomplete.

Ms. Dayton will return with further refinements.

Tabled because the application is incomplete – Motion by Herrmann, passed 6-0.

61-2010

408 Goldsborough St.

Kurt Herrmann, Contractor.

This application covers repairs at this address (stair risers, treads, railings; rotten siding; brick molding). All repairs will be like & same and are to the contemporary part of the building.

Approved as Submitted – Motion made by Gill, passed 5-0, Herrmann recused.

Items from the Commission

None

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

Respectfully submitted,

Roger A. Bollman, Chairman

cc: Zach Smith