

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
FEBRUARY 6, 2013**

Chairman Michael Lane called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. In attendance were Commission members Robert Busler, Douglass Gates, Lucy Maddox, Nancy McGuire, Meghan Habas Siudzinski and Robert Yeager, Kees de Mooy, Assistant Housing and Zoning Administrator, Jennifer Mulligan, Stenographer and guests.

Mr. Lane stated that the Chestertown Historic District Commission takes its authority from Chapter 93 of the Code of the Town of Chestertown and operates under the Historic District Design Guidelines that were adopted by the Mayor and Council of Chestertown on October 7, 2002 and revised March 7, 2012.

Mr. Lane asked if there were any additions or corrections to the minutes of the meeting of January 2, 2013. **Ms. McGuire moved to approve the minutes as submitted, was seconded by Ms. Siudzinski and carried unanimously.**

The first item on the agenda was BP2013-03 from Taylor Loughry Construction for a roof at 209 Washington Avenue. **Mr. Yeager moved to approve BP2013-03 from Taylor Loughry Construction for a roof at 209 Washington Avenue as he was familiar with the property and said that it conforms to the Chestertown Guidelines Section 3.7 for roofs, was seconded by Mr. Busler and carried unanimously.**

The next item on the agenda was BP2012-89 from the GAR Building at 206 S. Queen Street for a modification to the previously approved application for a ramp. This application requested a chairlift. Mr. Lane read the application into the record. Mr. Bob Ingersoll was present for the application.

Mr. Ingersoll stated that the ramp was going to be a very difficult application. He said that there was a very small alley and a standard foundation could not be used. Mr. Ingersoll stated that alternatives were sought and the best that they could come up with was an external chair lift on the left side of the existing deck. He said that the deck size would have to be increased in order to satisfy ADA requirements. Mr. Ingersoll stated that they would also install a brick sidewalk at the location.

Mr. Ingersoll stated that there was also a request to slightly move the location of the air to air heat exchangers for the HVAC system due to where the interior air handlers are located.

Mr. Ingersoll stated that he was uncertain what the permanent sign for the building would look like or where they would want to put it.

Ms. McGuire asked how old the existing deck was on the front of the building. Mr. Ingersoll stated that it was a newer deck, built after the building was jacked-up for the new foundation.

Mr. Ingersoll stated that the chairlift had a vertical lift of 52" and would likely be operated by the person riding in it. He said that there was a weight capacity of 490 lbs. He said that it was designed to be outside.

Mr. Yeager stated that he thought this was a tremendous improvement over the ramp. He said that screening it would be a good idea, noting that he thought the deck landing would become larger than 5' and suggested re-swinging the door. Mr. Lane stated that he thought a gate would drop down in front of a door that had to open. Mr. Ingersoll stated that the way the gate was designed; it would be hinged on the right and open to give protection from the stairs. Mr. Busler stated that he thought there would be an egress problem.

Mr. Ingersoll stated that the walkway to the entrance will not be any wider than the sidewalk would have been in concrete. He was only changing the material.

Ms. McGuire stated that she thought the chairlift would dominate the left side of the building. She said that it would have to be heavily planted to camouflage the lift. Mr. Ingersoll agreed. He said that both sides would need a balanced side of shrubbery.

Ms. McGuire asked if there was any other place to put the lift. Mr. Ingersoll stated that they thought about placing it in the back and even applied for an easement for the back of the building. He said that only a temporary easement could be granted, noting that the boundary line at the back of the building was only 57".

Mr. Busler stated that if adjustments could be made to the overall plan, he would prefer to see the lift in the back. Mr. Ingersoll agreed, stating that he did not know if that could happen because he could not guarantee what would happen in the back in the future, noting that there he only had 35½" to work with on the side of the building. Mr. Busler stated that nothing is built on the back of the building to date, so the architect may come up with some ideas to accommodate the ramp in the back.

Mr. Ingersoll stated that the Maryland Historical Trust has an easement on the building, so whatever the Trust disapproves cannot be done. He said that changes cannot be made without permission, noting that he started with the Historic District Commission first.

Mr. de Mooy stated that any entry through the back of the building would also require that person going down the elevator on the inside, through a catering kitchen, out the back door and around the stairs and side of the building to the front. He said that he thought the lift, from an ADA perspective, was better in the front.

**Mr. Yeager moved to table this application, with the applicant's permission, until a plan is received that covers all the issues with a direct proposal, was seconded by Mr. Gates and carried unanimously.**

Ms. McGuire asked if a site visit was necessary. Mr. Busler stated that he would like to see architect drawings before a site visit was planned.

Mr. Ingersoll asked what direction the Commission would like for him to go, as they were aware of the physical problems of the site. Mr. de Mooy stated that if the lift was possible in the back of the building would be the first choice. He said if there was a physical reason why the architect could not do that, than the option to put it in the front would be considered, with heavy screening. Mr. Yeager stated that he thought ADA entrances should be as close and easily related to everybody else's entrance to a building.

The next item on the agenda was BP2013-02 from Washington College for replacement windows at the Custom House at 101 S. Water Street. Mr. Reid Raudenbush of Washington College and Mr. Jay Yerkes of Yerkes Construction were present for the application. Mr. Lane read the application into the record, noting that there was a letter in the record from the Maryland Historical Trust approving the application.

Mr. Raudenbush stated that the existing windows were not original, but were installed around 1975. He said that the new windows would be custom made of Douglas fir, with a true-divided light and an interior storm.

Mr. Lane asked if the Maryland Historical Trust approved the existing windows. Mr. Raudenbush stated that he did not think the Trust had an easement on the property at that time and did not think that they were approved. He said that the Trust did want to stay with the same light pattern as exists today so they would be replicating what exists with a much higher quality window. Mr. Raudenbush stated that there were fifty-six windows in all.

Mr. Busler asked if there was a specification on the interior storm that would be used. Mr. Yerkes stated that the interior storms would be simple rail style and would look like interior trim with a weather-strip seal, rather than putting up aluminum storms.

Mr. Gates asked the status of the existing windows. Mr. Raudenbush stated that some the windows needed scraping and painting but others were so far gone that replacement was necessary. He said that the College would like to do all the windows at the same time.

Ms. McGuire stated that she would like to see cut sheets of the new windows and photos of the existing windows. Mr. Yerkes stated that there would be shop drawings for the windows as they were being made. Mr. Raudenbush stated that he had photos he would provide, as they were also submitted to the Maryland Historical Trust.

**Mr. Yeager moved to approve BP2013-02 from Washington College for the Custom House located at 101 S. Water Street as he was familiar with the property and that it was in accordance with the Guidelines under Section 3.6.3 Windows, with the understanding that the applicant will file shop drawings as they become available and provide photographs of the existing windows. The motion was seconded by Mr. Busler and carried unanimously.**

Mr. Lane stated that there was a request for a presentation by 7/11 for the current Bennett's II property located at the corner of Cross Street and Maple Avenue.

Mr. Adil Fantani with HFA Architects and Engineers presented. He said that this would be a conversion of the existing building, consisting of a major renovation and a 750 sq.ft. addition. He said that they were proposing brick veneer, Hardiplank siding, asphalt shingles for the roof, and CMU paint (on the back).

Mr. de Mooy stated that 7/11 has appeared before the Planning Commission for concept review. He said that revisions were made to the plans for this meeting, noting that the plans represented actual site conditions.

Mr. Kyle Burshard stated that the Planning Commission requested brick sidewalks where possible, and a request to shift an entrance away from an intersection. The mechanical equipment would run along the back side of the building and the trash enclosure would be on the back of the property.

Mr. Fantani stated that the canopy and gas tanks would be removed from the site.

Mr. Lane asked if there were issues with the front fenestration. Mr. Yeager stated that he was not happy with the panels in the last bay of the building and suggested working on that so that it doesn't appear as a garage door that was filled in as easily as possible.

Ms. McGuire stated that the front façade should have some relief, as it was too flat a plane. Mr. Busler suggested recessing the windows from the brick. Ms. Siudzinski stated that there was a lot of glass showing and was concerned over the light that would be coming from the building at night.

Ms. Siudzinski asked why only the back bay had the darkened window. Mr. Burshard stated that would actually be a storage room. The Commission was in agreement that something different should be done there.

Mr. de Mooy asked if there was a physical division between the existing building and the addition. Mr. Fantani stated that it would become one. Mr. Busler suggesting pulling the addition proud from the back to give the front of the building some relief. Mr. Yeager suggested breaking the ridgeline in the roof. There was also a suggestion to fill in some of the windows halfway with brick. Ms. Siudzinski suggested the blackout film across the windows.

Mr. Yeager stated that there were stores in Chestertown that have large windows with no relationship at all to what is going on in the store. He said that he thought the Commission would like to avoid looking at the back of a display rack and posters all over the windows.

Mr. de Mooy asked that samples be provided when the applicant returns.

Mr. de Mooy stated that Mr. James Anthony of the Chesapeake Bank & Trust Co., was present to discuss a project they were considering regarding the installation of an ATM machine at the building located on Cross and High Streets.

Mr. Anthony stated that the application the bank submitted did not have enough information for the Commission to act on, but he wanted to submit what they did have for some feedback that could be used when he returned at the March meeting.

Mr. Anthony stated that the intent was to install a free-standing exterior ATM machine either on the High Street side of the bank or the Cross Street side. He said that the photos he submitted outlined possible placement.

Mr. Anthony stated that fifteen years ago, there was an approval for an ATM machine to the left of the main entrance to the building. Mr. Anthony stated that he saw this as an opportunity to also relocate the FedEx and UPS machines out from under the portico and locating them in the same area as the ATM machine.

Mr. Anthony stated that the High Street side had a deeper recess than the Cross Street side. Mr. Busler stated that he thought the front face of the ATM should be close to the sidewalk. Mr. Yeager stated that he thought there would be less damage to the building if it was located on the Cross Street side.

Mr. Lane stated that it appeared as though the Commission was in concurrence that an ATM machine would be welcome.

Ms. Siudzinski suggested turning the machine so that the width was up against the neighboring wall. Mr. Anthony stated that there was a Magnolia tree right there and though that would not be possible.

Mr. Yeager stated that the Guidelines 3.12.5 indicated that ATM machines should be located on the least important elevation and be as unobtrusive as possible.

Mr. Anthony asked if the enclosure was in keeping with the design of the building would the Commission allow the ATM on the High Street side. Mr. Busler stated that it might be cost prohibitive to build something like that on the High Street side.

Ms. McGuire asked if the Commission would be interested in hosting a regional social hour and training session with the Maryland Association of Historic Districts. The Commission seemed to be interested, noting that someone would have to take charge of coordinating it.

**Mr. Yeager moved to adjourn the meeting at 5:54 p.m., was seconded by Ms. McGuire and carried unanimously.**

Submitted by:   
Jennifer Mulligan  
Stenographer

Approved by:  
Michael Lane  
Chairman