

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**  
**HEARING MINUTES**

**APRIL 22, 2010**

**Commissioners**

Tim Daniel, Chairman

Scott Winnette, Vice Chairman

Timothy Wesolek

Robert Jones

Joshua Russin (not present)

-

**Aldermanic Representative**

Michael O'Connor

**Staff**

Emily Paulus, Historic Preservation Planner

Nick Colonna, Comprehensive Planning

Scott Waxter, 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**

Ms. Paulus announced that there is an upcoming event in the City of Frederick on May 8, 2010 from 9 until 1 and they are going to have Paula Reed from Paula Reed and Associates come to speak about the character defining features of Mid-Maryland architecture. She went on to say that the event is primarily for the Commissioner's of both the City of Frederick HPC and the County Preservation Commission to try to get all of the Commissioner's their required training hours in this year since the annual Preservation Conference is on the Eastern shore and would be difficult for the Commissioner's to get to.

## **II. Approval of Minutes**

### **1. April 8, 2010 Hearing / Workshop Minutes**

**Motion:** Scott Winnette moved to approve the April 8, 2010 Hearing minutes and the April 8, 2010 Workshop minutes as written.

**Second: Timothy Wesolek**

**Vote: 4 - 0**

- **II. HPC Business**

**There was no HPC Business**

**IV. Consent Items**

-

**There were no consent items.**

-

- V. Cases to be Heard**

**2. HPC10-57**

**116-118 E. Patrick Street**

**Anson Smith**

Demolish the rear 2 story part of the building

*Emily Paulus*

**Presentation**

Ms. Paulus entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the applicant is seeking approval to demolish a two-story wing on the rear of a three-story, mid-19<sup>th</sup> century contributing commercial building. The wing features brick walls, 6/6 wood windows with splayed brick lintels and wood sills, and metal roof. The structure appears to be in good condition and was determined to be contributing at the April 8, 2010 hearing. The demolition is being sought in order to construct a three-story addition that would measure approximately 99' by 36' (HPC #10-58).

Following the March 25, 2010 workshop, the applicant modified the demolition plan to preserve more of the wing's south and east walls at both the first and second floors. However, with the exception of the north wall, they would still be concealed by the new construction.

## **Discussion**

John Williams, representing the applicant, stated that his major comment is he agreed with staff on most everything except that you can't see it and it doesn't effect other properties significantly so by exposing to the inside of a court no one will ever see it but he was willing to work with staff because it is essential economically to get all the units in there. He added that the owner is willing to safe it as an internal feature and they could put up more glass.

Mr. Winnette asked what the applicant thought about staff's suggestion to adding a hyphen and potentially moving the project back into the yard space. Mr. Williams answered that they have a problem with the City that you have to have the rear yard.

Mr. Winnette stated that it is seen so it is not an invisible addition and he was very appreciative of the staff's comment to create some kind of hyphen because it does seem less of an addition to a historic contributing building but adhering new construction to an historic contributing building. Mr. Daniel stated that he concurred with his fellow Commissioner with the concerns raised and he felt the replacement plan does not compensate for the loss at this point in terms of where it is at. He added that he thought that the one comment about it being a more utilitarian structure versus the front that is one of the key aspects to it that they don't want to lose because that is

a historical pattern in the development and he thought that is something that should at least be acknowledged in the new construction.

Mr. Daniel proposed moving the case to a workshop either immediately after the hearing that evening or give time for the exploration of other products and the case go to workshop after the next scheduled hearing. Mr. Williams stated he was fine with it either way.

**Public Comment - There was no public comment.**

### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends denial of the proposed demolition plan for the building's two-story rear wing because it would compromise the contributing status of the building it is attached to and thus is inconsistent with the *Guidelines*.

Staff recommends that the applicant modify the proposal to allow more of the wing to be visible from the exterior.

**Motion:**        **Scott Winnette moved to continue to the workshop later in the evening.**

**Second:**       **Timothy Wesolek**

**Vote:**           **4 - 0**

**3. HPC10-64  
LLC**

**113 W. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street**

**Eng Associates,**

Construct two rear additions

*Emily Paulus*

## **Presentation**

Ms. Paulus entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the applicant is seeking post-construction approval for two additions at the rear of a contributing duplex. The additions would maintain the same footprint (approximately 5' by 13') as the previous porches.

The applicant is proposing to make the following changes to the existing structure:

- 1. Remove the existing T1-11 siding and replace it with smooth HardiePlank lap siding with a 6" exposure;
- 2. Reconfigure the sizes of the window openings and replace the existing windows with all wood Jeld-Wen 1/1 double-hung-sash;
- 3. Replace the entry doors with TruStile Traditional wood door #PL200;
- 4. Reconstruct the stoops using a non-pressure treated wood for all visible components and typical Frederick stoop details (tongue and groove flooring, 1x1 square pickets);
- 5. Install 8" Hardie Trim over rim boards between the first and second and second and third floors.

The existing roofline and roofing (standing seam metal) would be retained.

## **Discussion**

Brian Lim, representing the owner of the property, stated that he submitted the modified plans to staff so he was hoping the Commission had a chance to look them over so they could make the decision in regard to the cut sheets as well as the modifications the Commission was looking for at the last workshop.

Mr. Daniel stated that regarding the feedback given at the last workshop it seemed like the returned application with the materials looks very good. Mr. Winnette stated that he agreed with the Chairman and thanked the applicant for responding to the last workshop.

Alderman O'Connor stated that he appreciated the applicant's willingness to work with the Commission and the Commission's willingness to work with the applicant.

**Public Comment - There was no public comment.**

### **Staff Recommendations**

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the rear additions with the proposed modifications because they are consistent with the *Guidelines* for new additions.

Materials to be approved"

- Drawing A1.0.2, with revisions dated 4/12/10
- TruStile Traditional Series wood door #PL200
- HardiePlank lap siding with a smooth texture and 6" reveal
- 1"x8" HardieTrim over rim boards
- Jeld-Wen all wood double-hung windows
- All wood stoop with tongue-and-groove flooring and 1x1" square wood pickets (all visible wood to be non-pressure treated and painted)
- Exterior light fixture beside entry doors (cut sheet to be submitted to staff for final approval)

**Motion: Scott Winnette moved to approve the rear additions with the proposed modifications because they are consistent with the Guidelines for new additions and incorporate the materials as detailed in the staff report.**

**Second: Timothy Wesolek**

**Vote: 4 - 0**

**4. HPC10-96**

**426 N. Market Street**

**Steve Kocan**

Install dormers, new rear door, and ceiling

*Emily Paulus*

### **Presentation**

Ms. Paulus entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the applicant requests approval of the following work on a recently rehabilitated contributing building:

- 1. Reapproval of a dormer on the rear roof slope, to feature a flat metal roof, wood siding at the side walls, and a pair of all wood Ply Gem 1/1 windows. The dormer was originally approved in 2006 but never constructed (the approval expired in 2008).
- 2. Installation of a new Kolbe and Kolbe wood and glass panel door on the rear of the building, to replace existing plywood paneling that covers an original door opening;
- 3. Installation of a new wood tongue-and-groove ceiling door opening;
- 4. Installation of 2 A/C units in the shared alley.

### **Discussion**

Charles Miller, the agent with Residential Design Professionals, stated that the only thing that he wanted to add was after the application was submitted the home owner has been walking around and noticed an increasing amount of Hardi-Plank being used and was interested in using that on the dormer that they proposed. He went on to clarify that the staff report mentioned four A/C units and on HPC sheet 5 there are two shown on the north side and two shown on the south side, the north end being at the



bottom of the page, the two on the north end are for the adjacent neighbor and they asked approval for only the two on the south end.

The Commissioners asked what staff's opinion was on using the Hardi-Plank on the dormers. Ms. Paulus answered that it is a new dormer although the dormer would be located on the historic roof slope of the building, but as new construction and construction that is not readily seen from the street she had no concerns with it.

Mr. Daniel asked the applicant if they wanted to amend the application to have the Hardi-Plank in the smooth finish. Mr. Miller answered yes and added that the Hardi-Plank would extend into the rake board and fascia on the front.

**Public Comment - There was no public comment.**

### **Staff Recommendations**

Staff recommends approval of Items 1 through 4 because they are consistent with the Commission's *Guidelines*.

Materials to be approved:

- Drawings HPC1, HPC2, HPC3, HPC4, and HPC5, dated 3/18/10
- Ply Gem 100 Series all wood double-hung windows
- Kolbe and Kolbe Manor Sash Designs Door #KK6210
- Smooth Hardi-Plank 6" exposure for siding with smooth Hardi-Trim.

**Motion:** Scott Winnette moved to approve item 1 through 4 because they are consistent with the Commissions Guidelines and incorporate by reference the staff recommendation including all materials.

**Second:** Robert Jones

**Vote: 4 - 0**

**5. HPC10-103**

**2 N. Market Street**

**Anson Smith**

Replace awning roof with standing seam metal  
**McNeill, agent**

**Barry**

*Emily Paulus*

### **Presentation**

Ms. Paulus entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the applicant is seeking approval to replace the asphalt shingle roofing at the shed roof awning located between the building's first and second floor. A portion of the roofing was damaged during the recent winter snowstorm and the applicant has assessed that the majority of the roofing is severely deteriorated and in need of replacement.

The applicant is open to either of the following approaches: replacement in-kind with new asphalt shingles or the installation of red standing seam metal.

### **Discussion**

Barry McNeill, representing the applicant, stated that he agreed with the staff report and went on to say that the shingles could give an architectural and could give it a cedar shake look as a lot of buildings way back when had it. He added that the piece is not original and is not that old. Mr. McNeill also stated that the standing seam is something used downtown but it may overpower the building especially depending on the color. Ms. Paulus added that if the Commission wanted to debate or even consider the metal she thought color would play a big role on how you would get away with it on that building. She added that she thought that a color either green or red would look more "awning" like than a galvanized or a natural aluminum finish, less industrial a little more like an awning would look. Mr. McNeill stated that color was not a problem for him if they choose standing seam.

Mr. Jones asked if there were two types of shingles on the building now. Mr. McNeill answered yes that it has just been repaired over the years and they just kept adding different shingles.

Mr. Wesolek stated that since the awning is not original to the building he wanted the Commission to figure out what color standing seam would work so that it would look okay and let the applicant run with that.

Mr. Daniel stated that he shared staff's hesitation with the standing seam and one concern with using standing seam would be not so much the color but the rhythm and the texture that it gives to the roof. Ms. Paulus asked if you could do a flat seamed metal roof. Mr. Daniel answered that a flat seam would be more appropriate if one would go metal. He added that given the detailing of the building up above standing seam would contradict that and if they were to go with shingles he could see doing something that would keep it toned down.

Mr. Daniel asked the applicant if they would be willing to hold the case off for two weeks to go to workshop after the next scheduled hearing so more information to be gathered by that time. Mr. McNeill answered that was completely fine. Mr. Colonna pointed out that the applicant would not receive an approval until the May 27, 2010 hearing and suggested that applicant work with staff to explore different options that way the applicant could get an approval at the May 13, 2010 hearing.

**Public Comment - There was no public comment.**

### **Staff Recommendations**

Staff recommends approval of the roofing on the building's shed awning in-kind. The applicant should submit a cut sheet for staff review prior to obtaining the final approval.

If the Commission is open to the idea of standing seam metal, moving the case to a workshop may be beneficial.

**Motion:**        **Scott Winnette moved to continue case number HPC10-103 at 2 N. Market Street to the May 13, 2010 hearing.**

**Second:**       **Timothy Wesolek**

**Vote:**           **4 - 0**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:03 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Shannon Albaugh

Administrative Assistant