

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

**NOVEMBER 9, 2010**

**Commissioners**

Scott Winnette, Chairman

Robert Jones, Vice Chairman

Timothy Wesolek

Joshua Russin

Gary Baker

Shawn Burns

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**

Mr. Jones announced he would need to recuse himself from HPC10-405 at 34 E. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street.

**II. Approval of Minutes**

**1. October 28, 2010 Hearing Workshop Minutes**

**Motion: Josh Russin moved to approve the October 28, 2010 hearing and workshop minutes as written.**

**Second: Timothy Wesolek**

**Vote: 6 - 0**

- **II. HPC Business**

**2. Administrative Approval Report**

**IV. Consent Items**

-

**There were no consent items.**

-

**•V. Cases to be Heard**

**3. HPC10-122**

**453 W. South Street**

**Neil Sinclair**

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

**Matthew**

*Lisa Mroszczyk*

## **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Mroszczyk entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that the subject building is composed of an early to mid-19<sup>th</sup> century log main block, a late 19<sup>th</sup> century frame addition to the east, and a post-1947 rear shed extension. The applicant seeks approval to demolish the following portions of the structure due to a combination of building code compliance issues and structural integrity (see 3/26/10 report from Allgaier Mendenhall Smith Structural Engineers):

- Dormer
- Partial demolition of front stoop
- Partial demolition of the gable and end walls
- Partial demolition of post-1947 frame shed extension

At the May 27<sup>th</sup> HPC hearing, the front stoop was determined to be non-contributing while the main block (including the east addition) and rear shed extension were determined to be contributing.

The applicant's replacement plan includes a one-story addition at the rear that would incorporate a portion of the original shed extension, reconstruction of the roof and reconstruction of the gable end walls to their current height.

## **Applicant Presentation**

Matthew Fine, with Zavos Architecture & Design, representing Sinclair Real Estate, LLC, stated that they had no exception to the staff recommendation. He added that the case went to a workshop a few times and they tried to listen to the Commission's wishes for the building and every time they scaled back on the new construction as well as the demolition. He went on to say that they have very tight restraints in the building to make it usable, modern and updated as far as the inside. Mr. Fine stated that there are signs of insect damage in the inside which is why they wanted to keep it open for some demolition of those walls. As far as the addition on the rear they talked about how to minimize the demolition of that shed and it seemed like a negotiation for the scale of what the addition would be.

## **Commission Questioning Discussion**

Mr. Dylus asked if the demolition plans complied word for word with the staff recommendation. Mr. Fine answered yes.

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

## **Staff Recommendation**

Since it will not compromise the integrity of the streetscape, the integrity of any surrounding historic properties or the significance of the overall building itself, staff recommends approval for the following subject to an approved replacement plan:

- Partial demolition of post-1947 frame shed extension
- Partial demolition of the front stoop
- Removal of the dormer

Staff also recommends the Commission approve the partial demolition of the deteriorated gable end walls with the following conditions:

- That they be reconstructed to match the height and form of the existing walls;
- That once the aluminum siding is removed, the applicant submit to staff the extent of end walls to be demolished; and
- That the required archival documentation includes photographs of the end walls after the aluminum siding removed but prior to any demolition.

## **Shed Extension, Front Stoop & Dormer**

**Motion:** Timothy Wesolek moved to approve the partial demolition of the post-1947 frame shed extension, partial demolition of the front stoop, and removal of the dormer as shown in drawings A101 that were presented that evening because it will not compromise the integrity of the streetscape, the

**integrity of any surrounding historic properties or the significance of the overall building itself**

**Second: Shawn Burns**

**Vote: 6 - 0**

### **Gable End Walls**

**Motion: Josh Russin moved to approve the partial demolition of the deteriorated gable end walls with the following conditions:**

- **That they be reconstructed to match the height and form of the existing walls;**
- **That once the aluminum siding is removed, the applicant submit to staff the extent of end walls to be demolished; and**
- **That the required archival documentation includes photographs of the end walls after the aluminum siding removed but prior to any demolition.**

**Second: Shawn Burns**

**Vote: 6 - 0**

**4. HPC10-254**

**447 W. South Street**

**Neil Sinclair**

Rehabilitation and addition  
**agent**

**Matthew Fine,**

*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 approved by the Commission at the July 22, 2010 hearing (HPC10-121). The proposal includes a two

story frame addition measuring approximately 9 feet by 9 feet, restoration of a portion of the second story side porch and the addition of a one story porch at the rear.

Proposed materials include the following:

- Sash and six panel wood doors;
  - Double-hung wood windows;
  - Fiber cement lap siding and trim;
  - Standing seam panel roofing with snowbirds to match existing ;
  - Painted wood inset picket railing;
  - Wood tongue-and-groove porch flooring;
  - Fiber cement 1x3 porch ceiling;
  - Concrete stoop with broom finish;
  - Installation of new light fixtures;
  - Round profile aluminum gutters and downspouts;
- 
- Replacement of a modern front door with a six panel wood door; and
  - Repointing as needed

### **Applicant Presentation**

Matthew Fine, with Zavos Architecture & Design, stated that they had no problem going with the wood bead for the soffits.

### **Commission Questioning Discussion**

Mr. Baker stated that the standing seam roof seemed to be more of a snap-lock instead of a true standing seam roof. He wondered if the compatibility and flashing details would work for it because they were rather complex sections of roofs. Mr. Fine answered that the specific details of it will be worked out but they had no problems right now. Mr. Baker stated it should match the real standing seam. Mr. Dylus asked if the standing seam roof would be visible from the street. Mr. Fine answered yes.

Mr. Jones thought the lighting on the front elevation looked more industrial in style and application.

Mr. Winnette asked if there was a response to Mr. Baker's concern about the compatibility of the two roof forms. Mr. Fine answered that they had no problem converting it back to a traditional crimped design but they thought since it was new construction it should reflect a new style and technique to install the roof.

Mr. Winnette asked if there was a response to the concerns about the lighting. Mr. Fine answered they realized that traditionally there were not lights on the buildings and if there was it was in the transoms. He added that they could alter the specification on that if that was the Commission's wish.

Mr. Russin asked Mr. Jones what light would seem more appropriate or if he would prefer to defer that to staff. Mr. Jones stated that he would defer to staff. Mr. Winnette was not concerned about the more industrial light being installed on the porch of the new construction. Mr. Winnette asked if the applicant would be willing to work with staff on the design of the light on the front elevation. Mr. Fine answered yes.

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

### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends approval of the application as consistent with the Commission's *Guidelines* with the following conditions:

- All fiber cement material have a smooth finish;
- All new wood elements be painted or stained with a solid color opaque stain;
- Deteriorated mortar be removed with hand tools only;
- New mortar be lime-based and match the color, texture and tooling of the existing;
- Light fixtures be installed into the mortar joints only when installed on the existing building;
- The second floor side porch ceiling to be either beaded tongue-and-groove wood planks or beaded wood panel.



**Materials to be approved:**

- Proposed Work Synopsis dated October 21, 2010 (2 sheets)
- Drawings A-001, A-201, A-202, A-301, A-302, A-303 dated 10/21/2010
- Simpson Thermal Sash 7044 and Traditional 2130 wood doors
- Pella Architect Series wood windows
- HardiePlank lap siding, HardieTrim Board and Hardie Soffit Panels (3 sheets)
- Senox Corporation Half Round Rain Gutter System
- ATAS Dutch Seam standing seam panel roof (3 sheets)
- LSI Industries Abolite Eastport wall-mounted light fixtures

**Motion: Josh Russin moved to approve the application as presented with the following conditions:**

- **All fiber cement material have a smooth finish;**
- **All new wood elements be painted or stained with a solid color opaque stain;**
- **Deteriorated mortar be removed with hand tools only;**
- **New mortar be lime-based and match the color, texture and tooling of the existing;**
- **Light fixtures be installed into the mortar joints only when installed on the existing building;**
- **The second floor side porch ceiling to be either beaded tongue-and-groove wood planks or beaded wood panel.**

**With the materials to be approved:**

- **Proposed Work Synopsis dated October 21, 2010 (2 sheets)**
- **Drawings A-001, A-201, A-202, A-301, A-302, A-303 dated 10/21/2010**
- **Simpson Thermal Sash 7044 and Traditional 2130 wood doors**
- **Pella Architect Series wood windows**
- **HardiePlank lap siding, HardieTrim Board and Hardie Soffit Panels (3 sheets)**
- **Half round gutters**
- **Crimped standing seam panel roof (3 sheets)**
- **Wall mounted light fixtures that would be approved by staff**

**Second: Shawn Burns**

**Vote: 6 - 0**

**5. HPC10-372  
(Frisby)**

**209 E. 6<sup>th</sup> Street**

**Alecia Rohrer**

Demolish garage

*Lisa Mroszczyk*

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Mroszczyk entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that this application concerns the demolition of a concrete block garage that was found to be contributing to the significance of the historic district at the October 28, 2010 hearing. The foundation and overhead door would be retained for use in the construction of a new garage (HPC10-373).

### **Applicant Presentation**

Alecia Frisby, the owner of 209 E. 6<sup>th</sup> Street, concurred with the staff.

### **Commission Questioning Discussion**

Mr. Winnette stated that he went out to the site and agreed with the staff report and it is unfortunate that the neighboring garage fell upon the applicant's. He thought to repair it would be to remove it and rebuild it which is what they are asking to do. Mr. Winnette asked how confident the contractor was that they could reuse the foundation. Ms. Frisby answered completely confident.

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

## **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends that Commission approve the demolition of the garage based the damage it incurred after the adjacent structure collapsed on to it compromising its integrity and because its demolition will not compromise the streetscape or and surrounding historic properties. The approval should be subject to an approved replacement plan and the submission of the required archival documentation for contributing resources.

**Motion:**        **Shawn Burns moved to approve the demolition of the garage subject to an approved replacement plan and the submission of the required archival documentation for contributing resources.**

**Second:**       **Timothy Wesolek**

**Vote:**           **6 - 0**

**6. HPC10-405  
Parnes**

**34 E. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street**

**Stephen**

Replace asphalt roof in-kind on rear one story attached shed

*Lisa Mroszczyk*

## **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Mroszczyk entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that this application concerns the replacement in-kind of an asphalt roof on a one story attached shed structure dating from the 1920s at the rear of a contributing building.

## **Applicant Presentation**

Stephen Parnes, the applicant, stated that seeing the state of this asphalt shingle roof which has weeds growing through it he wanted to replace it before winter. He stated that it was not until he received the staff report that he realized it likely was a standing seam metal roof in its original state. He went on to say that the Guidelines stated that the HPC may be lenient in its approval of external alterations on non-street facing elevations and this is hidden from the street, you would need to be in the rear yard or on one of the neighboring balconies to see the one story shed roof. The Guidelines also state that in regard to roofing materials asphalt shingles can be used to replace existing asphalt or asbestos shingles and the roof does currently have asphalt shingles.

### **Commission Discussion Questioning**

Mr. Baker asked what the roof slope was on the shed. Mr. Parnes was not sure. Mr. Baker stated that it looked generally low and wondered if the applicant had checked the warranty on the shingles because most companies will not warranty anything under a 4:12 roof pitch and it looks as though the shed roof may be lower than that.

Mr. Winnette asked if the applicant would be interested in a standing seam metal. Mr. Parnes answered he was and if he was able to do that he would be willing. He wanted to receive approval for shingles for the time being to stabilize the roof but with the history of this building he would consider working with Ms. Mroszczyk in the future to get administrative approval for the standing seam metal roof.

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

### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends denial of the application as inconsistent with the Commission's *Guidelines* because the asphalt roof is neither original nor appropriate for the age of the building.

**Motion:** Timothy Wesolek moved to deny the asphalt roof at this time because it is not consistent with Commission's Guidelines.

**Second:** Gary Baker

**Vote:** 6 - 0

**7. HPC10-409  
Cemetery**

**515 S. Market Street**

**Mt. Olivet**

Replace and expand ramp  
**Pearcey, agent**

**J. Ronald**

*Lisa Mroszczyk*

### **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Mroszczyk entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that this application concerns the removal of a wooden ramp on the main entrance of the Key Memorial Chapel in Mt. Olivet Cemetery and the construction of a new stone ramp with wrought iron railings. The ramp will extend perpendicular to the main entrance through the porte-cochere to a landing at the edge of the existing road and then continue to both the north and south following the curve of that road. The existing granite steps will be reused along with new matching granite in the steps that will provide access to the ramp from the road and from both sides beneath the porte-cochere. All other materials and details will match those on the building and site.

### **Applicant Presentation**

Ron Pearcey, with Mt. Olivet Cemetery, stated that this is something that will look nice and it is something that is well overdue at the cemetery because they are using the Chapel more and more now so they need access for the handicapped people.

## **Commission Discussion Questioning**

Commissioners thought it was a great design and appreciated the matching of the stone.

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

## **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends the Commission approve the construction of a new stone ramp with black metal railings, including the removal and reuse of the existing granites steps according to drawings A1.1 and A1.2 dated September 23, 2009 and the written scope of work.

**Motion: Josh Russin moved to approve the construction of a new stone ramp with black metal railings, including the removal and reuse of the existing granites steps according to drawings A1.1 and A1.2 because of the ADA requirements that should be met in a manner that results in the least amount of damage to the historic buildings and this project follows that task.**

**Second: Shawn Burns**

**Vote: 6 - 0**

**8. HPC10-413**

**111 E. 3<sup>rd</sup> Street**

**Meta Nash**

Install iron railing at front stoop

*Lisa Mroszczyk*

## **Staff Presentation**

Ms. Mroszczyk entered the entire staff report into the record and stated that this application concerns the installation of a metal railing at an existing concrete stoop at a late nineteenth-century contributing resource.

## **Applicant Presentation**

Meta Nash, the applicant, stated that they received a letter from the insurance company stating that they needed to put a railing up so they tried to find something that was compatible and she did not want to damage the front of the building. She was concerned about the stability and she did not want a false sense of structural integrity. She added that she talked to the welder after receiving the staff recommendation and there are ways to do the pipe with a sleeve that would anchor it without it looking different.

## **Commission Discussion Questioning**

Mr. Baker asked if the railing going across the top would be secured to the side of the concrete. Mr. Nash answered that they were going to put the 1" post there and that is something staff did not want to happen so they are willing to set it back from the cheek wall.

Mr. Winnette agreed with staff that it is a beautiful form of porch.

Mr. Jones asked if they would still have the structural integrity with the alteration. Ms. Nash answered that the workman said yes and she even called Paul Gerlach with the City who is a code reviewer to see if he felt it would pass structurally without it being installed into the cheek wall or the face of the building and he thought it would be challenging but could be done.

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

## **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends approval of the installation of the iron railing at the existing stoop as consistent with the Commission *Guidelines* with the following conditions:

- The railing or posts not be attached to the building to limit impacts on the door surround;
- The 1" square posts proposed to be attached to the cheek wall at the edge of the landing be set off the face of that wall so as not to disrupt the overall form of the stoop;
- The applicant must submit a revised drawing reflecting these conditions before applying for any buildingzoning permits.

**Motion:**        **Shawn Burns moved to approve the installation of the iron railing at the existing stoop as consistent with the Commission *Guidelines* with the following conditions:**

- **The railing or posts not be attached to the building to limit impacts on the door surround;**
- **The 1" square posts proposed to be attached to the cheek wall at the edge of the landing be set off the face of that wall so as not to disrupt the overall form of the stoop;**
- **The applicant must submit a revised drawing reflecting these conditions before applying for any buildingzoning permits.**

**Second:**        **Gary Baker**

**Vote:**            **6 - 0**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:01 PM.



Respectfully Submitted,

Shannon Albaugh

Administrative Assistant