

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
HEARING MINUTES
FEBRUARY 9, 2012**

Commissioners

Scott Winnette, Chairman
Robert Jones, Vice Chairman
Gary Baker
Shawn Burns
Kate McConnell (not present)
Stephen Parnes
Brian Dylus, Alternate

Aldermanic Representative

Michael O'Connor (not present)

Staff

Lisa Mroszczyk Murphy, Historic Preservation Planner
Christina Martinkosky, Historic Preservation Planner
Scott Waxter, Assistant City Attorney
Matt Davis, 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

Ms. Murphy announced that Preservation Maryland is holding a Restoration and Renovation Fair on April 28, 2012 in Baltimore. There will be a \$10 fee to attend. Some of the Commission members will be attending as a training event and it is also open to the public.

Ms. Murphy also reminded everyone that the Historic Preservation awards nomination form is due on March 16, 2012. She added that the Commission is now on Facebook so you can go onto to www.facebook.com/cityoffrederickhpc and it will provide general information about the activities the HPC may be holding and also general preservation related news.

II. Approval of Minutes

1. January 26, 2012 Hearing/Workshop Minutes

Motion: Shawn Burns moved to approve the January 26, 2012 hearing and workshop minutes as written.
Second: Brian Dylus

Vote: 5 - 0

II. HPC Business

2. Administrative Approval Report

IV. Consent Items

a. Cases to be Approved

b. Cases to be Continued

V. Cases to be Heard

3. HPC11-725

2 Clarke Place

Charles Riser

Construction of fence

Christina Martinkosky

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martinkosky entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the applicant seeks to enclose the rear yard by installing a solid board fence with a lattice top. The proposed fence will be 6' in height and will be made of cedar. All posts will feature decorative cedar caps. The design of the fence also includes three gate openings that will be constructed of solid wood boards. The gate located near the west property line will also feature a pedimented entry way.

Applicant Presentation

Charles Riser, the owner of 2 Clarke Place, stated that he appreciated the time and effort that has gone into this and over the last couple months they have had a lot of good dialogue with both the staff and the board and they have all gotten pretty much on the same page about this. He understood the staff's concern about the visual sight lines however when they were discussing at the workshop they talked about a 4' area on the corner and they moved away from that. He went on to say that he would really like to have the design the way it is on the plans with the addition of the lattice work on top. They had renderings done from anywhere between 6" away from the fence to standing in the middle of the street at different corners just to give them an idea of what the visual sight lines will be of a person that is about 5'8". Mr. Riser added that the yard itself slopes down a little bit so the posts will be at 6' but the fence itself will be a little bit lower than that and because the fence is sitting off anywhere between 10 to 20 feet from the street because of the way it is designed it will actually be sitting even lower than that if you are standing on the sidewalk because of the way the yard slopes down from the sidewalk. Mr. Riser stated he believes the impact is not going to be as strong as if they were building the fence right along the street and having it 2" off the sidewalk. Mr. Riser stated that he supported the staff's recommendations but the company installing the fence made it known that it will be difficult to add lattice on top of the gates because they are free floating, moving objects but they will try to make it work and if they can't they will come back for staff approval. He added that they would also like to keep the fence at 6' all the way including the northwest corner because they do not know where they would start that transition.

Commission Questioning/Discussion

Mr. Winnette asked if they had considered removing the lattice on the section between the northwest corner and the house because that would be a natural way to transition between the two especially is they are not planning on putting the lattice on the gate. Mr. Riser answered no.

Mr. Burns stated that he had no issues with the fence being 6' all the way around.

Mr. Parnes asked how high the lattice would be. Mr. Riser answered that he was not sure but about 1' although he did not know if the contractor was planning on placing some of the lattice in a frame so the exposed portion may be less than 1'. Mr. Parnes stated that he appreciated the new perspectives that were provided to them which they asked for at the workshop.

Mr. Winnette stated that he was more sympathetic for the height of the fence considering the grade but the first corner you come into as you are coming into to Frederick is higher than the rest so that very corner of the fencing is going to appear pretty high. Mr. Winnette added that he was grateful that that were willing to remove the lattice on the northwest corner since there would be less of the building obstructed.

Public Comment – There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of a solid board fence with a lattice top with the following conditions:

- The gates are constructed with solid boards and a lattice top to blend into the rest of the fence.
- To remove the pedimented detail by the side entry gate.
- The architectural detailing on the west (side) elevation of the house is not obscured by either lower the northwest section of the fence to 5' or to remove this section completely.
- The fence is oriented with the finished, or "beauty side," facing outward towards surrounding properties and right-of-way.

Motion: Brian Dylus moved to approve the application as follows:

- **The fence layout be in accordance with "The Riser Residence" drawing by Porter Brook dated January 11, 2012, drawing A shows the fence continuing beyond the sidewalk and turning back to tie in next to the fireplace;**
- **The gates are constructed of solid boards and a lattice top to blend with the rest of the fence with the understanding that if the gate is not structurally sound due to it's the homeowner will have to come back to get staff approval for full height board on board gates;**
- **To remove the pediment detail by the side entry gate;**
- **To orient the fence with the finished or "beauty side" facing outward towards the surrounding properties and right-of-way;**
- **To maintain a 6' height all the way around as shown on the drawing, in other words not dropping the fence down to 5' as you go north and east on the sidewalk.**

Second: Shawn Burns

Vote: 3 – 2, Scott Winnette and Robert Jones opposed

4. HPC12-39

Replace door

Lisa Mroszczyk Murphy

122 W. 4th Street

Meredith Steere

Mr. Winnette announced that the applicant was not present so the case will need to be continued to the next scheduled hearing.

Motion: Shawn Burns moved to continue the case to the February 23, 2012 hearing.

Second: Gary Baker
Vote: 6 - 0

- 5. HPC12-43** **47 S. Carroll Street** **Jane & Goodloe Byron**
 Reconstruct shed with new roof and siding
Christina Martinkosky

Staff Presentation

Ms. Martinkosky entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the following scope of work is for a one-story, semi-enclosed shed located behind 49 South Carroll Street. This ca. 1964 building was determined to be a non-contributing resource to the Frederick Town Historic District at the September 8, 2011 public hearing (HPC-11-518). At the same hearing, the Historic Preservation Commission gave permission to demolish the entire building. The applicant has amended their plan so that only a portion of the structure was demolished. The following alterations are proposed for the remaining portion of the building:

- 1) Strengthen the existing structure by replacing and repairing damaged materials. The existing columns may need to be strengthened or increased in size to support the new roof and siding. All structural alterations will take place inside of the building and will not be visible once the siding and roof is installed.
- 2) Pour a concrete slab for the principal structure and "Garden Shed" wing that extends from the north elevation.
- 3) Install 5"x5" painted posts of untreated lumber to support the eastern section of the "Garden Shed" wing. The eastern, open-aired portion of the "Garden Shed" wing will be sheltered by the principal roof.
- 4) Construct a gabled roof with standing seam metal (16" o.c.). The proposed roof will feature exposed rafter ends and snow boards that will be painted to match the roof. The applicant also proposes to install 4 ½ round gutters that will be finished to match the roof.
- 5) Attach 24 PV solar panels to the south slope of the roof. Each panel will measure 3'-3" by 5'-5".
- 6) Construct exterior walls clad with rough cut oak 10" boards with 1" ship lap painted "Web Grey" by Duron. Trim is to be of painted wood.
- 7) Place painted wood louvers in upper gables.
- 8) Install sliding "barn doors" made of 10" painted wood boards with 1" ship lap. The doors will slide and when opened the doors will stack on top of each other.
- 9) Parge existing CMU foundation.
- 10) Pour a concrete walkway near the east elevation.

Applicant Presentation

Goodloe Byron, owner of 47 S. Carroll Street, stated that they were before the Commission to talk about the shed in the rear yard that they concluded could be very useful for storage so they decided to try and renovate to keep in good use. The materials they have chosen are materials that they have had good experience with and seem to fit the Guidelines.

Matt Loudon, agent for Goodloe & Jane Byron, stated that the plan is how they would like to construct it and they think they have all the materials correct. He added that it will be a nice addition to that area and the courtyard.

Commission Questioning/Discussion

Mr. Baker asked if they were going to go with a rolled ridge rather than ridge cap on the roof. Mr. Byron answered that they have always had the roofing company put the roll it over in a traditional method.

Mr. Baker stated that he thought it was a handsome looking modification. He thought it complied with the Guidelines to a degree but the steepness of the roof pitch is more agricultural and less industrial looking.

Mr. Byron stated that they arrived at that pitch because according to his expert it is the optimal pitch for the solar panels. Mr. Baker stated that he thought that was a better way of integrating the solar panels into the building instead of putting them on platforms.

Public Comment – There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends approval of the application.

Motion: Brian Dylus moved to approve the application as submitted in accordance with the staff recommendations in the report dated February 3, 2012 and that the drawings and proposed work conform to the integrity of the streetscape of the adjacent area and do not impact the integrity of any surrounding historic properties with the exception that on the drawing dated January 18, 2012, Detail 4 on Sheet A1.2 that the standing seam metal roof at the ridge be a rolled ridge cap in lieu of the cap that is shown on the drawing.

Second: Shawn Burns

Vote: 6 - 0

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 6:30 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Shannon Albaugh,
Administrative Assistant