

Easton Historic District Commission
Easton, Maryland
November 28, 2011

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

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 5-0.

Consent Docket Approvals - None

Staff Approvals - None

Business:

78-2011 22 East Avenue Barclay Upchurch, Contract Purchaser, Charles Goebel, Architect.

This is the second hearing of this application. A site visit by the Commission was made on 11/18/11.

At this meeting the applicant presented written testimony from a historic consultant that the corrugated metal building had lost its historic significance and is now considered “non-contributing”. Also, a structural engineer had examined the metal building and found it to be in a

seriously deteriorated condition and would require extensive repairs to restore. Both the reports are made part of the record. The applicant has no plans to replace the metal building after it is demolished given the current economic conditions. A member of the public spoke at length. Mary Carol Shannahan is a member of the Shannahan family (19th and 20th century hardware sales) who originally built the building to house their steam farm equipment. She traced the history of her family's involvement in early steam farm equipment sales and postulated that the building is an important part of Easton's heritage and is a symbol of the evolution of the technology of its day.

The details of changes to the masonry building have not been established yet but, the general feeling of the Commission was as follows:

- Replacing the two large vehicle doors with composite rollup doors in the same style as the existing front façade door. *The Commission would not likely consider replacement of the East Avenue. vehicle door; this should be repaired. The August St. door can be appropriately replaced.*
- Replacing the existing mandoor doors in the same style. *The Commission would not likely consider replacement of the East Avenue mandoor door; this should be repaired. The August St. mandoor door can be appropriately replaced.*
- Replacing the existing wood windows with composite windows in the same style and size. *The Commission would require that existing windows be repaired (unless some are proven irreparable).*
- Adding signage in the sign recess above the front windows. *Not discussed.*
- Replacing the existing metal roof in kind. *The Commission will likely approve this when details are known.*
- Adding skylights. *The Commission will likely approve this when details are known and if they are compatible with the building and the neighborhood.*
- Adding photovoltaic material to the south facing roof. *The Commission would likely approve this when details are known and if they are compatible with the building and the neighborhood.*

The application is incomplete and no decisions are possible.

Tabled because the application is incomplete – motion by Herrmann, passed 5-0.

79-2011 26 N. Washington Street Stephen Waldman, Michelle Rose Salon.

This application is for a hanging business sign at this address. The location of the sign mounting was given as just to the south of the north entrance door to the salon. (shown on the photo in the file.) The design of the sign was reviewed.

The application meets the Guidelines on page 68 R1 and R2.

Approved as Submitted – Motion by Theeke, passed 5-0.

80-2011 204 Brookletts Ave. Talbot Bone, Owner.

This application covers replacement of the existing carriage house doors. The current doors are deteriorated and beyond repair.

This application meets the spirit of the Guidelines on pg 34 R1 and 48 R3 & R4.

Approved as Submitted – Motion by Sener, passed 4-0, Bollman recused.

Items from the Commission

- Considerations for the 2011 Historic District awards.
- Consideration of meeting times.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger A. Bollman, Chairman
Historic District Commission

cc: Zach Smith