

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
HEARING MINUTES

DECEMBER 9, 2010

Commissioners

Scott Winnette, Chairman

Robert Jones, Vice Chairman

Timothy Wesolek

Joshua Russin

Gary Baker

Shawn Burns (not present)

Brian Dylus, Alternate

-

Aldermanic Representative

Michael O'Connor

Staff

Emily Paulus, Historic Preservation Planner (not present)

Lisa Mroszczyk, Historic Preservation Planner

Scott Waxter, Assistant City Attorney

Nick Colonna, Division Manager of Comprehensive Planning

Shannon Albaugh, HPC Administrative Assistant

•I. Call to Order

Mr. Winnette 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 Mayor and Board of Aldermen 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

There were no announcements.

II. Approval of Minutes

1. November 23, 2010 Hearing Minutes

Motion: Timothy Wesolek moved to approve the November 23, 2010 hearing minutes as written.

Second: Gary Baker

Vote: 6 - 0

- **II. HPC Business**

2. Administrative Approval Report

IV. Consent Items

-

There were no consent items.

-

- V. Cases to be Heard**

**3. HPC10-440
Station, Inc.**

230 W. Patrick Street

Way

Install gazebo
Anibaldi, agent

Vince

Lisa Mroszczyk

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mroszczyk entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that this application concerns the construction of a 12'x16'x12' vinyl gazebo with a composite floor and asphalt shingles at the rear of a non-contributing building constructed between 1990 and 1991.

Applicant Presentation

Vince Anibaldi, with Way Station, Inc., stated that the gazebo was going to be used by clients while smoking. He added that it would get the smoking area away from the building so people are not walking through the smoke when walking in the building.

Commission Questioning Discussion

Mr. Jones asked if the gazebo would be going right over the drainage for the landscaping. Mr. Anibaldi answered that it would go closer to the building where the drain will be open right on the corner of it so it will not be covering the drain.

Mr. Baker made the point that there is a solar greenhouse that would be blocked from pedestrian view if the structure was built.

Mr. Winnette asked if they had looked at other alternatives. Mr. Anibaldi answered that he would be open for suggestions. Mr. Baker asked if they had thought about building a four post structure closer to where the sidewalks intersect each other. Mr. Anibaldi answered that they could. Mr. Baker suggested using something with a lower flat pitched roof with transparent sides.

Mr. Winnette suggested continuing the case to a workshop to give more opportunity to have conversations about alternatives. Mr. Anibaldi agreed to go to workshop.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Commission deny the application because the use of vinyl is not supported by the guidelines and because the size and the location of the gazebo will negatively impact the setting.

Motion: Timothy Wesolek moved to continue the discussion of this project to the next hearing which is scheduled for December 21, 2010 and that they will spend time with the applicant at the closing of this meeting in a workshop session.

Second: Gary Baker

Vote: 6 - 0

**4. HPC10-445
Carol Powell**

11 W. 2nd Street

Joseph &

Demolish garage
Moron, agent

Mike

Lisa Mroszczyk

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mroszczyk entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that this application concerns the demolition of a four bay concrete block garage constructed at the rear of the property. The replacement plan (HPC10-414) includes the construction of a larger garage, new fencing and paving.

NOTE: Please refer to application HPC10-414 for additional photographs of the garage.

Applicant Presentation

Michael Moran, with Lancaster Craftsmen Builders, felt that the garage should be deemed a non-contributing resource because the garage is mostly exposed cinder block and is an eyesore since some of it is painted and some is not. The garage itself does not meet the needs of the client not just from an aesthetic stand point but functionally as well. He said that the garage doors do not open high enough for a lot of modern vehicles to fit in so the vehicles get parked in front of the garage anyway which is pretty much the only place to view the garage.

Commission Questioning Discussion

Mr. Winnette asked staff if she could speak more to the historic significance of these garages. Ms. Mroszczyk answered that they see this all over the historic district. After World War II it was a very prosperous time and people were building larger more prominent garages that the Guidelines talk about. She thought it was a classification of a resource that it becoming to be something that people are considering replacing but it is also a period in the historic district that the Guidelines speak to and they need to be careful about that category of resource.

Mr. Jones asked where the water drains off the roof of the existing structure. Mr. Moran answered that it runs against the gable of the structure behind it. He added that there is a photograph that shows water damage in the interior of the structure from the water not being drained correctly.

Mr. Winnette stated that this structure is likely within the period of significance and the Commission's task isn't necessarily aesthetic but historic preservation so while some people may not think cinder block is attractive it is the type of garage that was built in that period. Mr. Baker agreed. He thought that it reflects the entire context that is behind the house and is a very unique form that is common back area lots. He added that the garage is compatible and fits the scale. It does not rise above the other structures that are there and it blends the whole neighborhood together with a low pitched single sloped roof regardless of the material. It is the shape and form that contributes to the backyard.

Mr. Winnette stated that this type of cinder block construction for garages is very common in the district and was the type of garage built during this period.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Commission find the garage at 11 West 2nd Street to be contributing to the significance of the historic district because it defines a pattern of development and has historical value as part of the post-war period.

Motion: Scott Winnette moved to find the garage at 11 West 2nd Street to be contributing to the significance of the historic district because it defines a pattern of development and has historical value as part of the post-war period.

Second: Gary Baker

Vote: 4 - 2, Brian Dylus & Timothy Wesolek opposed

**5. HPC10-447
Sinclair**

453 W. South Street

Neil

Rehabilitation & addition
Fine, agent

Matt

Lisa Mroszczyk

Staff Presentation

Ms. Mroszczyk entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that this application serves as the replacement plan for the partial demolition that was approved on November 9, 2010 (HPC10-122) and includes a rear addition measuring 18'-6" by 13'-1" with the following materials:

1. Hardie-Plank fiber cement siding-4" and 6" exposures;
2. Pella Architect Series Casement and double hung wood windows;
3. Simpson sash door (7044);
4. Hardie-Plank fiber cement trim, fascia and soffit;
5. Wood brackets; and
6. Met-Fab Historic Panel standing seam metal roof with a "slate gray" finish as well as Senox round profile aluminum gutters and downspouts.

The application also concerns the following rehabilitation work to the existing building:

1. Reconstruction of the roof structure in-kind including a Met-Fab Historic Panel standing seam metal roof with a "silver" finish and Senox round profile aluminum gutters and downspouts;
2. Installation of two Velux fixed deck mounted (FS) skylights approximately 23" by 46" on the rear roof slope;
3. Removal of the metal siding and the application of Lahabra NTS stucco with a smooth finish to match the underlying material;
4. New wood lap siding on the remaining portion of the frame shed extension;

5. Replacement of all windows with either Pella Architect Series casement or double hung wood windows;
6. Replacement of a modern front door with a new Simpson six panel wood door (2130);
7. Conversion of a door to a window on the rear of the building;
8. Replacement of the cellar doors at the rear;
9. Repointing and repair of the chimney; and
10. Installation of a new wrought iron railing at the front stoop.

New Kitchler Seaside wall lanterns with a black finish will be installed at the front entrance and rear addition.

Applicant Presentation

Matthew Fine, with Zavos Architecture & Design representing Sinclair Real Estate, stated that the developer and design team intend to bring this property back to its highest use and put it back in occupancy. He added that they had adjusted the scale and backed off a little bit to be sure this is a feasible project and that they are being as sensitive to the historic nature of the property. As far as the demolition application there are a lot of things that are contingent on removing the vinyl siding and seeing what is under there and what the condition of the structure is. Mr. Fine said that as far as the openings that staff mentioned they have had no exception to staff's comments and they requested that all the windows are replaced and there were no exceptions with keeping the configuration as is but if they retained one or two windows out of all of them they would have there would not be a cohesive design. He added that there would be no exceptions with the retention of the door in the rear.

Commission Discussion Questioning

Mr. Dylus asked where the condenser unit would go if the window was changed into a door. Mr. Fine answered that the door would not function so the function of the condenser unit would not be lost.

Mr. Baker asked why the overhang on the rear addition goes the full length of the house instead of being over just the door. Mr. Fine answered that the intention was to give some sort of a sheltered entrance to the back of the building and to call out a different scale of detail and manner of detail in the original building. Mr. Baker agreed with having the overhang above the door but it was an unusual detail to extend it all the way across and he did not see the need to do it. The material selection and scale of everything else is very nice looking. Mr. Jones agreed.

Mr. Dylus asked if there was a way to move the windows around so there would be one façade with preserved windows and the other three have new. Mr. Fine thought that was feasible with the scale of the demolition and the rehabilitation of the building they will be taking all the windows out. Ms. Mroszczyk stated there are only two historic windows and three windows altogether on the front façade. Mr. Winnette suggested repairing the two windows on the left and replacing the vinyl window on the right with a new wood window.

Public Comment - There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval for the construction of an addition as consistent with the Chapter 9 of the *Frederick District Guidelines* according to items #1-6 described in the project description and according to drawings A-201, A-202, A-301 and A-302 dated 11-18-10 with the following conditions:

- All fiber cement material has a smooth finish.
- Any windows with muntins have simulated divided lights with a dark color, non-metallic spacer bar.
- All wood be painted or stained with a solid color opaque stain.

With the condition that any repointing be with a lime-based mortar and that the railing have square straight pickets only, Staff recommends approval for items # 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15 and 16 as described in the project description because they are consistent with the *Guidelines* as further described in this report.

Staff recommends the Commission approve the installation of windows in the gable ends only as there are no windows there currently and the proposed windows are appropriate.

Staff recommends the Commission deny the replacement of all other windows because it has not been demonstrated that the remaining historic windows are deteriorated beyond repair and because the proposed replacement for the existing vinyl window is not entirely consistent with the Commission's *Guidelines* regarding the configuration of the panes.

Staff recommends the Commission deny the replacement of the door on the rear of the building with a window because the *Guidelines* encourage the retention of historic openings.

Motion: Scott Winnette moved to approve the construction of an addition as consistent with the Chapter 9 of the *Frederick District Guidelines* according to items #1-6 described in the project description and according to drawings A-201, A-202, A-301 and A-302 dated 11-18-10 with the following conditions:

- 1.
 1. All fiber cement material has a smooth finish.
 2. Any windows with muntins have simulated divided lights with a dark color, non-metallic spacer bar.
 3. All wood be painted or stained with a solid color opaque stain.

With the condition that any repointing be with a lime-based mortar and that the railing have square straight pickets only, and approval for items #7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 14, 15 and 16 as described in the project description because they are consistent with the *Guideline*. He moved to approve the installation of the windows in the gable ends and replacement of the window in the rear if it is determined not to be a historic window in consultation with staff.

Second: Josh Russin

Vote: 4 - 2, Gary Baker and Robert Jones opposed.

Motion: Scott Winnette moved to deny the replacement of all other windows because it has not been demonstrated that the remaining historic windows are deteriorated beyond repair and because of the Guidelines in regard to windows that they need to be repaired rather than replaced and the denial of the replacement of the door on the rear of the building with a window because the *Guidelines* encourage the retention of historic openings.

Second: Brian Dylus

Vote: 5 - 1, Timothy Wesolek opposed

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:30 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Shannon Albaugh

Administrative Assistant