

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
HEARING MINUTES

MAY 27, 2010

Commissioners

Tim Daniel, Chairman

Scott Winnette, Vice Chairman

Timothy Wesolek

Robert Jones

Joshua Russin

Gary Baker

Shawn Burns

Brian Dylus, Alternate

-

Aldermanic Representative

Michael O'Connor

Staff

Emily Paulus, Historic Preservation Planner

Nick Colonna, Comprehensive Planning

Rachel Depo, Assistant City Attorney

Shannon Albaugh, HPC Administrative Assistant

•I. Call to Order

Mr. Daniel called the meeting to order at 6:00 P.M. He stated that the technical qualifications of the Commission and the staff are on file with the City of Frederick and are made a part of each and every case before the Commission. He also noted that the Frederick City Historic Preservation Commission uses the Guidelines adopted by the Commission and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation published by the U. S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, and these Guidelines are made a part of each and every case.

All cases were duly advertised in the Frederick News Post in accordance with Section 301 of the Land Management Code.

Announcements

Mr. Daniel announced that he recused himself from HPC10-121 and HPC10-122

II. Approval of Minutes

1. May 13, 2010 Hearing / Workshop Minutes

Motion: Timothy Wesolek moved to approve the May 13, 2010 hearing and May 13, 2010 workshop minutes as written.

Second: Scott Winnette

Vote: 7 - 0

- **II. HPC Business**

There was no HPC Business.

IV. Consent Items

-

2. HPC10-131 139 W. South Street James Callear

Install a missing rear porch

Nick Colonna

Motion: Scott Winnette moved to approve the application.

Second: Joshua Russin

Vote: 7 - 0

-

•V. Cases to be Heard

3. HPC10-106

201-205 Broadway Street

William Wood

Replace wooden door with metal door on shed

Nick Colonna

Presentation

Mr. Colonna entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that this application concerns the installation of paired six panel galvanized doors on a 10' by 20' shed. The previous application for the construction of a 10' by 20' shed included the approval of paired six panel wood doors.

Discussion

Shanan Maynard, representing the applicant, concurred with the staff report.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Commission approved the installation of the paired six panel galvanized doors as submitted with case number 10-106.

Motion: Joshua Russin moved to approve installation of the paired six panel galvanized doors as submitted because the material will be in line with the non-traditional siding material.

Second: Timothy Wesolek

Vote: 7 - 0

4. HPC10-121

447 W. South Street

Neil Sinclair

Demolish wood garage, kitchen addition, and side deck
Fine, agent

Matthew

Emily Paulus

Presentation

Ms. Paulus entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the applicant seeks approval to demolish the following portions of a mid-19th century single-family dwelling:

- Post-1947 wood garage structure that adjoins the main block's west elevation
- Post-1947 porch infill and adjacent deck and stair at the east elevation
- One-story rear addition

The structure is part of the HPC-approved Steiner Terrace development (#09-89). The applicant's proposal includes demolishing the wood garage structure and leaving the space open, removing the one-story rear addition and replacing it with a smaller one-story sunroom addition, and removing the two-story porch infill and exterior stair and deck and replacing it with a slightly larger enclosed addition.

Discussion

Matthew Fine, with Zavos Architecture & Design representing the applicant, stated that right now as they are backing up to South Street they are limited with what they can do with the units so that they are livable and maintained for a long period. He added that they tried to make the case that in order to use the sites they would need to basically put the meat and bones of the buildings up front to South Street as much as possible. He went on to say that in order to occupy the backyards with some parking is the reasoning for removing the kitchen addition. He also stated that the comments regarding what had been staff's opinion of a contributing feature it had been found

that the siding is a cementitious asbestos and there is significant deterioration in the structure so they had concerns about the structural stability of the structure.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission determine the following:

- The rear one-story addition meets the criteria to be considered contributing, because it adds historical value and was built during the District's Period of Significance;
- The garage does not meet the criteria to be considered contributing, because documentary and physical evidence suggests it was not constructed during the Historic District's Period of Significance and it does not rise to the level of being important for its association with a significant event, person, or architectural movement of national relevance.
- The porch infill, deck, and stairs do not meet the criteria to be considered contributing because they were not built during the District's Period of Significance and do not add historical or architectural value to the property.

Motion: Robert Jones moved to determine that the rear one-story addition meets the criteria to be considered contributing, because it adds historical value and was built during the District's Period of Significance, the garage does not meet the criteria to be considered contributing, because documentary and physical evidence suggests it was not constructed during the Historic District's Period of Significance and it does not rise to the level of being important for its association with a significant event, person, or architectural movement of national relevance, the porch infill, deck, and stairs do not meet the criteria to be considered contributing because they were not built during the District's Period of Significance and do not add historical or architectural value to the property.

Second: Gary Baker

Vote: 5 - 1, Timothy Wesolek opposed

5. HPC10-122

453 W. South Street

Neil Sinclair

Demolish rear shed addition and portions of end walls
Fine, agent

Matthew

Emily Paulus

Presentation

Ms. Paulus entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the applicant seeks approval to demolish the following portions of an early to mid-19th century log structure:

- End walls at second floor
- Roof
- Windows and doors throughout
- Front stoop
- Post-1947 frame shed extension

The structure is part of the HPC-approved Steiner Terrace development (#09-89) and - up until now - had been proposed for rehabilitation. The applicant is seeking partial demolition due to a combination of building code compliance issues and structural integrity (see 3/26/10 report from Allgaier Mendenhall Smith Structural Engineers).

The applicant's proposal includes raising the roof of the structure an additional 18" in order to gain more headroom at the second floor. The side walls would be reconstructed largely due to extensive termite damage. A two-story addition would be added to the rear.

Discussion

Matthew Fine, with Zavos Architecture & Design representing the applicant, stated that he wanted to reiterate the justification of the project and they realized it was a log structure about 6 months ago and they uncovered some of the interior they saw that there was some significant damage to the wood. He added that they looked several scenarios to re-use this property and each time they looked at it they are scaling back and realizing as time goes forward how significant the structure is. Mr. Fine went on to say that in any scenario they have had a structural analysis of the building and whether it is approved for demolition or not they would have to reconstruct the roof and the floor system.

Mr. Baker stated that he concurred with most of the staff staff was recommending but he holds very near and dear the scale, basic shape and massing of the little log cabin and it's clearly hidden in the fact that it has been covered up for many years with siding and stucco but just the basic shape of it denotes that it is an early structure. He added that the back addition is a very nice evolution of scale and a humble, modest kind of addition for this house.

Mr. Burns asked if there was any consideration to trying to remove the stucco and expose some of the log on the exterior. Mr. Fine answered that they consulted with a firm who specializes in early log structures and that was the worst thing recommended to do.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends that the Commission determine the following:

- The main block of the building meets the criteria to be considered contributing, because it adds historical value and was built during the District's Period of Significance;
- The rear shed extension does not meet the criteria to be considered contributing, because documentary and physical evidence suggests it was not constructed during the Historic District's Period of Significance and it does not

rise to the level of being important for its association with a significant event, person, or architectural movement of national relevance.

- The front stoop does not meet the criteria to be considered contributing because it was not built during the District's Period of Significance and does not necessarily add historical or architectural value to the property.

Motion: Gary Baker moved to find the front stoop and entrance way non-contributing but the back and the building itself be found contributing to the resources of the historic district even though it doesn't meet the criteria of national importance and significance.

Second: Timothy Wesolek

Vote: 5 - 0

6. HPC10-140

7-9 W. Patrick Street

Philip Catron

Remove lower panel & extend storefront window, replace door

Nick Colonna

Presentation

Mr. Colonna entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the applicant is seeking to remodel the existing façade that entails the following:

1. Removal of wood panel below the large panel window;
2. Replace glass with full height, single pane windows;
3. Omit horizontal mullions; and
4. Replace existing door with full glass wood door.

Discussion

Steve Knott, representing the applicant, stated that the reason for taking the window all the way down and taking the panel out was to increase the visibility of the retail space.

Mr. Jones asked if the original structure is behind the paneling. Mr. Knott answered that the evidence inside indicates that the storefront may have been stepped back with maybe large steps but that was all speculation. He added that if they were to remove the panels right now that would take it down to floor level so the glass would be level with the existing floor allowing for a display area.

Mr. Baker asked if the applicant was planning on reusing the stops. Mr. Knott answered no they were going to do a similar frame for the window. Mr. Baker then asked how much of the metal framing will be seen after the new installation. Mr. Knott answered that the intention was to provide a new aluminum frame all the way around similar to what's there it would just be a larger frame without the horizontal mullions. Mr. Baker stated that he was a little hesitant because he was not clear on what they were suggesting and he asked if they could provide a sketch or something so the Commissioner's will be able to see it.

Mr. Jones agreed with Mr. Baker and stated that he would feel more comfortable if he saw an elevation drawing to get a good understanding of the scale and proportions.

Mr. Winnette asked if the applicant would be willing to continue the application for two weeks until the next scheduled hearing to allow time to get additional materials ready. Mr. Daniel asked if the applicant was requesting the application be continued to the next hearing pending further submission from the applicant for the materials. Mr. Knott answered yes.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the approval to remodel the existing façade at 7-9 W. Patrick Street with the following conditions:

1. Omit horizontal mullions currently located within the window panels (part of original request);
2. Replace glass with single pane windows that extend to the existing wood panels bellows the existing large panel windows (staff recommendation);
3. Replace existing door with full glass wood door (part of original request).

Motion: **Scott Winnette moved to continue the case to the June 10, 2010 hearing.**

Second: **Timothy Wesolek**

Vote: **7 - 0**

7. HPC10-149

225 E. 5th Street

Patrick Hannon

Demolish rear addition and shed

Emily Paulus

Presentation

Ms. Paulus entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the applicant is seeking approval for the following demolition of the following structures at an early 20th century rowhouse:

1. The one-story rear addition
2. The one-story shed in the rear yard.

The replacement plan is contained in application HPC #10-150.

Discussion

Patrick Hannon, the applicant, stated that he had not seen the Sanborn Maps but definitely the structure that's there was not original and if there was an open porch there were no signs of it because the structure is on pier footings with galvanized anchors and it is covering up the basement entrance from outside.

Mr. Winnette stated that based on the photographic evidence he agreed with staff.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Commission determine the following:

- The rear one-story addition does not meet the criteria to be considered contributing, because it is so highly altered that it neither adds historical or architectural value nor helps define the district.
- The shed does not meet the criteria to be considered contributing because it was not built during the District's Period of Significance and does not add historical or architectural value to the property.

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the demolition of the structures for the reasons stated above, pending approval of the replacement plan (HPC #10-150).

Motion: Scott Winnette moved to determine that the rear one-story addition does not meet the criteria to be considered contributing, because it is so

highly altered that it neither adds historical or architectural value nor helps define the district, the shed does not meet the criteria to be considered contributing because it was not built during the District's Period of Significance and does not add historical or architectural value to the property. He also moved to approve demolition of the structures for the reasons stated above, pending approval of the replacement plan (HPC #10-150).

Second: Timothy Wesolek

Vote: 5 - 1, Gary Baker opposed

8. HPC10-150

225 E. 5th Street

Patrick Hannon

Reopen enclosed front porch

Emily Paulus

Presentation

Ms. Paulus entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the applicant is seeking approval for the following rehabilitation work on an early 20th century rowhouse:

1. Removal of the non-original infill at the front porch enclosure. The walls, windows, and door would be removed. The existing roof, soffit, concrete floor, and concrete steps would remain. The new open porch design would include tapered painted wood columns and a typical painted wood railing and handrail. The design would mimic the porches seen at the neighboring properties, including 227 and 229 East 5th Street, and return the porch more closely to its original appearance. Because the interior walls of the enclosed porch now feature interior wood paneling, the applicant is proposing to remove the

remaining vinyl siding from the rear elevation (after the one-story addition is removed) and reinstall it on the first floor of the façade.

2. Removal of the vinyl siding on the rear elevation (for use on the front façade) and installation of new vinyl siding to match the existing as closely as possible.

The applicant has already received Administrative Approval for the following additional rehabilitation work on the property: removal of non-original vinyl windows and installation of all wood, 1/1 MW windows, removal of non-original front and rear doors with an all wood Simpson paneled and glass door, replacement of gutters and downspouts throughout, installation of new wood board fencing throughout (HPC #10-148).

Discussion

Patrick Hannon, the applicant, stated that he is definitely not in love with the vinyl that is there. He went on to say that he was not so sure on the wood because none of the other houses on the row have wood - they have the asbestos siding and one house has vinyl siding and he thought about the wood but he

thought there would be a huge mix / match between asbestos, wood and vinyl. He stated that he wasn't sure if there was some type of Hardi-Plank that would more closely resemble the asbestos but he hadn't looked into that too much. Mr. Hannon also stated that the idea of patching the siding from the back onto the front was because it would be the least invasive approach.

Mr. Winnette asked what type of step they were planning on using at the back door. Mr. Hannon answered that they were planning on submitting another application for a rear patio and they were thinking with the rear patio they would do concrete steps.

Mr. Wesolek asked how big the space that needed to be covered with siding was. Mr. Hannon answered 15' wide by the top 5 or 6 feet.

Mr. Winnette asked if they were putting in new columns. Mr. Hannon answered no they were using the existing framing but covering them with wood painted white.

Mr. Baker thought the vinyl siding should be removed and completely new siding should go up and he thought that there may be something behind the shingles such as clapboard siding. Mr. Hannon stated that in the areas that the shingles have broken and fallen there all that it is under-lament and was not a finished siding material.

Mr. Winnette suggested using a German lap-siding. Ms. Paulus stated that she was not sure if there was a cementitious solution that would be appropriate.

Mr. Russin asked if the case could be continued to do a little bit more research to see what an appropriate siding would be for this structure. Mr. Daniel asked the applicant if they would be amenable to continuing the case for two weeks. Mr. Hannon answered yes.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendations

Staff recommends that the Commission:

1. Approve the removal of the non-original infill at the front porch enclosure and install new tapered painted wood columns and a typical painted wood railing and handrail to match the neighbor's porches because it clearly meets the Commission's *Guidelines* by resembling historic porches that exist in the neighborhood and maintaining consistency with the style and period of the building; and
2. Approve the removal of the vinyl siding at the front façade and replace it with painted wood lap siding in an exposure to match the existing; and
3. Install vinyl siding from the front façade at the exposed portion of the first floor rear elevation where the rear addition is to be removed.

Motion: Joshua Russin moved to continue the case until June 10, 2010 to allow the applicant and staff the opportunity to explore other siding options at the request of the applicant.

Second: Scott Winnette

Vote: 7 - 0

9. HPC10-157

20 E. South Street

Evelyn Cook

Rebuild porch roof and replace siding

Emily Paulus

Mr. Daniel announced that in the applicant and agent's absence the case will be continued to the next scheduled hearing.

Motion: Scott Winnette moved to continue the case to the June 10, 2010 hearing.

Second: Timothy Wesolek

Vote: 7 - 0

The meeting was adjourned at 7: 54 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Shannon Albaugh

Administrative Assistant