

**HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
HEARING MINUTES
AUGUST 11, 2011**

Commissioners

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

Aldermanic Representative

Michael O'Connor

Staff

Lisa Mroszczyk, Historic Preservation Planner
Christina Martinkosky, Historic Preservation Planner
Scott Waxter, Assistant City Attorney
Joe Adkins, Deputy Director of Planning
Shannon Albaugh, HPC Administrative Assistant

I. Call to Order

Mr. Jones 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

Mr. Adkins introduced the new part time Preservation Planner, Christina Martinkosky. She started within the last two weeks and she will be presenting at the next scheduled hearing on August 25, 2011. He added that they went through quite a few candidates and she rose above the rest. She will truly be an asset to the Planning Department.

II. Approval of Minutes

1. July 28, 2011 Hearing Minutes

Mr. Wesolek asked if the applicant had any pictures from the inside. Mr. Meacham answered that he did not because he would have to remove the wall from the inside under the window to show them what he is talking about as far as the structural changes that have been done. Mr. Wesolek asked how far down the wall goes from the top of the bulkhead. Mr. Meacham answered about 12 to 16 inches.

Ms. McConnell asked if there was still some wall behind the bulkhead or if it was all cut out for the height of the angle. Mr. Meacham answered that the wall comes straight down to the floor on the inside but if you took the wall out from the inside there are beams that come down and two of the beams have been cut because the bulkhead comes above them.

Mr. Jones stated that there is German clapboard siding out there and millwork applications that could duplicate that very easily. He agreed with staff that it is very uncharacteristic of the cellar doors in the Historic District because it is out of scale and proportion. He added that it does detract from the streetscape because of the steep pitch. Mr. Meacham stated that you could get siding custom built to fit in the opening if the bulkhead was lowered but you would see a difference because the remaining siding on the house has aged and to have brand new wood and paint there is going to detract from the front façade as well. Ms. McConnell stated that portions of siding rot all the time and people do spot replacement so she did not think it was an uncommon occurrence in the Historic District. She added that eventually the whole front of the house will need to be painted so at some point it will be exactly the same color.

Mr. Parnes just wanted clarification that the applicant purchased the property knowing it was in violation of the Frederick Town Historic District Guidelines. Mr. Meacham answered the he purchased the property knowing that it was in violation of the Guidelines due to the fact that they prefer the bulkhead to be lower and prefer the bulkhead to have non-metal doors except on a case by case basis. Mr. Parnes asked if there was any attempt to make arrangements to correct the violation before the house was purchased from the seller. Mr. Meacham answered no.

Ms. McConnell stated that if the decision were to go back to the original height the base that is closest to the street would still be in the same location therefore the cellar doors would be shorter.

Mr. Meacham stated that he looked at the Guidelines and they say that they prefer it a certain way but there is not a specification about how far the doors can come out from the house or the specific pitch of the bulkhead. Ms. McConnell stated that they do have evidence in a photo where the original height of the bulkhead was so they can determine the height and the base and it would not extend any further from where it is now. Ms. McConnell suggested the Commission say the bulkhead should be lowered the width of two clapboard reveals because when you look at the photo you can see that there is clearly two pieces of siding covered by the new bulkhead and the one that is just below the window is still there.

Public Comment – There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends denial of the application because the size and material of the bulkhead is not in keeping with the historic door and building and because it detracts from the streetscape.

Motion: Kate McConnell moved to approve the project with the following conditions:

- **The wood door on the bulkhead be wood and approved by staff.**
- **The cheek wall materials be approved by staff.**
- **The bulkhead lowered a minimum of 2 clapboard widths or a measurement approved by staff.**
- **The base of the bulkhead remain in the same location.**

they then moved it to that side. He went on to say that through the years there have been numerous materials added to it.

Commission Questioning/Discussion

There was no Commissioner questioning or discussion.

Public Comment – There was no public comment.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends the Commission find this attached shed addition to be a non-contributing feature and approve its demolition because it will not compromise the integrity of the streetscape, any surrounding historic properties or the overall building.

Motion: Shawn Burns moved to find the attached shed to be non-contributing because it is severely deteriorated and it has no architectural or historical value and does not help to define the historic district.

Second: Kate McConnell

Vote: 5 – 0

Motion: Timothy Wesolek moved to approve the demolition of the attached shed because it was determined to be non-contributing to the historic district and the demolition will not compromise the integrity of the streetscape, any surrounding historic properties or the overall building.

Second: Shawn Burns

Vote: 5 - 0

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:10 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Shannon Albaugh,
Administrative Assistant