

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
MARCH 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 February 6, 2013. **Mr. Busler moved to approve the minutes as submitted, was seconded by Mr. Yeager and carried unanimously.**

The items on the consent calendar were as follows:

- a. BP2013-11 Mary Pritchard, 119 High Street – skylights;
- b. BP2013-13 Coby Stohrer, 237 N. Kent Street – window replacement;
- c. BP2013-18 Doug Nicholson, 222 Calvert Street – exterior renovations;
- d. BP2013-22 Yerkes/Richman, 109-111 S. Mill Street – door and window; and
- e. BP2013-25 Shuman/Wilson, 312 Cannon Street – sign.

Mr. Yeager asked to remove BP2013-11 and BP2013-22 from the consent calendar.

Mr. Gates moved to approve the following applications as they were in keeping with the Design Guidelines and he was familiar with the properties;

- b. BP2013-13 Coby Stohrer, 237 N. Kent Street – window replacement;**
- c. BP2013-18 Doug Nicholson, 222 Calvert Street – exterior renovations;**
- e. BP2013-25 Shuman/Wilson, 312 Cannon Street – sign.**

The motion was seconded by Mr. Busler and carried unanimously.

The next item on the agenda was BP2013-11 from Mary Pritchard at 119 High Street. Ms. Pritchard was present for the application. Mr. Lane read the entire application into the record. Mr. Yeager stated he was uncertain if the sliding glass door on the plans was existing or new. Ms. Pritchard stated that it would be new but would be hidden behind the barn doors.

Mr. Lane stated that the only thing that the Historic District was concerned with was the sliding glass door and railing, skylights, and the gravel drive.

Ms. McGuire stated that she was familiar with the property and moved to approve an aluminum sliding glass door to be painted the same as the trim, with a wood railing, was seconded by Ms. Siudzinski and carried unanimously.

Ms. Siudzinski stated that if a different door was going to be used, the applicant should return for approval.

Ms. McGuire moved to approve the installation of two (2) skylights as submitted, was seconded by Ms. Maddox and carried unanimously.

Ms. McGuire moved to approve the brick and gravel driveway as submitted, was seconded by Mr. Gates and carried unanimously.

The next item on the agenda was BP2013-22 from Yerkes/Richman at 102-111 S. Mill Street for a door and a window. Mr. Yerkes and Mr. Richman were present for the application. Mr. Yeager asked for clarification of the glass on the front door. **Mr. Yeager stated that he was familiar with the property and the application conforms to section 3.6.1 doors and also conforms with the guidelines for windows and moved to approve the application as presented, was seconded by Mr. Busler and carried unanimously.**

The next item on the agenda was BP2012-137 from Patricia McGee at 228 N. Kent Street for an overhang over the back door. Ms. Mulligan stated that the applicant submitted further documentation regarding the overhang. Mr. Ingersoll was called into the meeting to answer any questions. Mr. Ingersoll stated that the overhang would be supported structurally with steel into the building, and that the structure would be self-supporting and project 2' from the building. **Mr. Busler moved to approve the application as submitted as he was familiar with the property and said that it generally met the guidelines, was seconded by Mr. Gates and carried unanimously.**

The next item on the agenda was BP2013-12 from Jonathan Slocum at 600-602 High Street for a garage. Mr. Slocum was not present, but Mr. de Mooy stated that he was familiar with the application and could answer any questions. Mr. Lane read the application into the record. Mr. de Mooy stated that the garage was pre-fabricated and would look exactly as the picture indicated with T-111 siding. Discussion ensued.

Ms. Siudzinski moved to approve the application of BP2013-12 at 600-602 High Street for a garage, as it was in accordance to the Design Guidelines section 3.10 for accessory buildings, was seconded by Mr. Busler and carried with six (6) in favor, Mr. Lane opposed.

Ms. Siudzinski moved that excavations be monitored by a professional archaeologist meeting the "Professional Qualifications Standards" of the Secretary of the Interior. The archaeologist is to be on site at all times when excavation takes place. If any archaeological features and artifacts are uncovered, excavation shall be temporarily stopped in that location and the archaeologist given reasonable time to record those materials via photography and mapping. The results of the monitoring will be summarized by the archaeologist in a report to be submitted to the Historic District Commission for review. The report may take the form of a letter, but shall in all

other respects conform to the *Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological Investigations in Maryland*, published by the Maryland Historical Trust. The motion was seconded by Mr. Yeager and carried unanimously.

Ms. Siudzinski moved to approve the demolition of the existing dilapidated shed in the rear of 600-602 High Street, was seconded by Mr. Yeager and carried unanimously.

The next item on the agenda was BP2013-15 from Stu Cawley at 111 Maple Avenue for a fence. Mr. Cawley was present for the application. Mr. Lane read the application into the record. **Ms. McGuire stated that she was familiar with the property and moved to approve the application for the fence as submitted, under B5 of the Design Guidelines, with the understanding that the structural parts of the fencing would have a clear preservative applied, was seconded by Ms. Maddox and carried unanimously.**

The next item on the agenda was BP2013-14 from Richard and Stephanie Wasserbly at 107 S. Water Street for an addition. Mr. and Mrs. Wasserbly were in attendance for the application, along with their architect, Mr. Richard Brown. Mr. Lane read the application into the record for the 655 sq.ft. addition.

Mr. Brown stated that they were trying to increase the size of the present kitchen in the house, expand the master bath and add a sleeping porch on the second floor. The Commission reviewed the designs.

Mr. Brown stated that the deck would be wood. The siding would be beveled wood with a 6" exposure. He said that they were still looking into trim details. Doors and windows would be Anderson 400 series divided lights with an insert in the glass to give a true-divided light appearance. Mr. Brown stated that Mr. and Mrs. Wasserbly have to go before the Zoning Board of Appeals to obtain approvals, but they wanted to present the plans to see if the Historic District Commission would approve what they were considering.

Mr. Yeager stated that he was familiar with the property and reviewed the drawings and moved that in general the plan was consistent with the Guidelines as far as massing, scale and detail, and moved to approve the addition in concept pending submission of further detail, specifically materials and other changes that may come about. Mr. Gates seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

The next item on the agenda was BP2013-19 from David Wright at 337 High Street for exterior renovations. Mr. Lane read the application into the record for Hardiplank siding. Mr. Lane stated that the last application for Hardiplank siding was denied and the matter went to court.

Mr. de Mooy stated that there was a person wanting to open a restaurant in this location and was looking for a sign approval. He said that there was resistance to approving a sign if the siding was not installed.

Mr. de Mooy stated that he looked at the Hardiplank siding Mr. Wright bought for the property and it was a textured finish, which was inappropriate. He said that Mr. Wright was willing to install smooth Hardiplank siding with a 6" reveal. Mr. de Mooy stated that the building has not had any siding for several years and painted sheathing was all that was on the building.

Mr. Yeager stated that when this application came before the Commission it was decided that Hardiplank siding would not be permitted. He said that there was confusion over what Mr. Wright had purchased and thought he had approved, but the Commission made the stand that there should be wood siding.

Mr. Gates stated that people have been allowed to remove wood siding and replace it with Hardiplank. Mr. de Mooy stated that Hardiplank siding has not been allowed on the front façade of a building where there was wood. Mr. de Mooy stated that in this case, there may have been wood forty or fifty years ago, but it was replaced with asphalt siding. Mr. de Mooy stated that when the asphalt siding was removed, there was only sheathing underneath.

Mr. de Mooy stated that on Cannon Street when the property owner was removing asphalt siding, he found only sheathing and was permitted to use Hardiplank siding.

Mr. de Mooy stated that this issue began five (5) years ago when the Commission was more conservative and the determination was made that there should be wood siding rather than Hardiplank, but that was before the Cannon Street decision was made.

Ms. Siudzinski stated that she was concerned about the prominence of the property and the precedent setting factor for material replacement as there was a clear indication that there was wood siding originally on the building.

Mr. de Mooy stated that he would take the liberty to revise the application to primed, painted, lap siding to match the wood that once existed.

Mr. Lane stated that there was still the issue of having a sign on the building before the work was finished. Mr. de Mooy stated that the two could be tied together. Mr. Lane stated that a sign should not be approved until the siding is on the building. Mr. Yeager stated that the sign could be approved conditional upon the siding be completed.

Mr. Yeager stated that he was familiar with the property in question, listened to the presentation, read the application and moved to approve smooth cedar wood or redwood siding with a 6" reveal, to be primed and painted, and it is required that siding be installed completely prior to any other permits being issued for this property, was seconded by Mr. Busler and carried unanimously.

The next item on the agenda was BP2013-20 from Crystal Anders at 337 High Street for a sign. **Mr. Yeager moved to approve the sign as submitted, with the condition that the siding on the building be completed (installed, primed and painted) before the sign is installed, was seconded by Mr. Busler and carried unanimously.**

The next item on the agenda was BP2013-26 from Jane Nevins at 105 S. Water Street to close in an alley window. Mr. Lane read the application into the record. Mr. Jay Yerkes of Yerkes Construction was present for the application. Mr. Yerkes stated that Ms. Nevins was concerned over fire code, along with privacy issues. He said that wood siding would be installed and it would look as though there were never windows there at all. He added that the windows would be saved in case there was a problem with other windows in the house. **Mr. Yeager moved to approve the application as submitted as he was familiar with the property and it was in general accordance with the Design Guidelines, was seconded by Ms. McGuire and carried unanimously.**

The last item on the agenda was BP2013-21 from 7-Eleven for a proposed store at Maple Avenue and Cross Street. Mr. Lane read the application into the record. Mr. Tim Glass, Mr. Ben Wilson, Mr. Kyle Burshard and Mr. Adele Fantani representing 7-Eleven were present for the application

Mr. Glass stated that last month's conversation focused around relief for the front façade of the building. He said that the bays were inset 4" and the addition was pulled forward 12". He said that still allowed for 5' sidewalk and appropriate circulation in the parking lot.

Mr. Glass stated that the roof pitch was an issue and he understood that different possibilities were discussed, but looked out of place.

Ms. Siudzinski stated that she did not think there was much appealing about the design. She suggested perhaps using smoked glass that can be seen through as it would screen what would be seen from the outside.

Ms. McGuire stated that this design was not much different than presented last month. She said that the pitch of the roof on the gable end should be changed somehow as it was too long of a plane. Mr. Yeager stated that if something could be done to "strengthen" the corner it would be easier to approve the plan.

Ms. Siudzinski stated that the angle on the current building softened it and asked if there was any thought to mimicking that on the addition. She said that the plane of the proposed building made it too stark.

Mr. Fantani stated that the glazing of the windows was an issue at the last meeting. He said that there was discussion of introducing elements to break down the starkness. He said that there was also discussion of raising the roof to break up the roofline. Mr. Fantani stated that they tried but could not come up with anything. He showed mock-ups

of their work, introducing a hip roof and then leaving it rectangular. He said that they abandoned the idea of raising the roof but moved the front addition forward 12" to provide some relief for the massing.

Mr. Fantani stated that a cement board that looked like brick was introduced to the structure and passed a sample to the Commission. Windows were made out of the bays and a sandstone material was used under the windows.

Mr. Yeager stated that he thought it was an improvement over last month, but something should be done with the gable.

Mr. Busler stated that the Commission was making suggestions so that the project would be approved. He said that he understood there were problems due to an existing condition, but the new construction could be raised, or they could make a taller "box" and apply pediments, raising the corners and have the roof come into it. He said that there were several buildings on Queen Street with square tops and parapets that they could draw from.

Ms. Siudzinski asked if the idea of keeping the angle had been reviewed. Mr. Burshard stated that they did not look at that because they were trying to conform the site to the parking requirements that they would have to meet.

Mr. Yeager stated that there appeared to be piers at either end of the gable and asked if they could be taken to the roofline.

Mr. Busler stated that this was a one story building with a lot of asphalt roofing. Ms. McGuire stated that standing seam roofing may help.

Mr. Burshard stated that there were competing preferences for what is happening and asked the Commission for a consensus.

Ms. McGuire stated that changing the windows on the gable end, changing the gables to Hardiplank siding and looking at the roof material were important items to change.

Mr. Yeager stated that Chestertown was a relatively vertical Town and a long-low profile was trying to fit into a predominantly Victorian community. Mr. Fantani asked what height the Commission was aiming for. Mr. Busler stated that 12" above the ridge line could work.

Ms. Siudzinski stated that an adaptive reuse of the building could echo some of the current design, aside from the garage bays. She said that she would like to see it on paper.

Mr. Yeager stated that there really was no consensus at this time on the building. Mr. Yeager stated that there should be a break in the center line of the roof.

Mr. Burshard stated that he understood that the Commission wanted to see the roof raised on the new addition. Mr. Busler stated that the team would have to take their creativity to solve the issues addressed.

Ms. McGuire echoed that changing the windows on the gable ends, changing the gable ends to Hardiplank, look at the roofing materials, "smoking" the windows with a tinted glass, using an angled entrance or more prominent "head" to the new addition would all be good starts. There was concern over the shallow pitch of the roof, so breaking up the massing would help. Ms. Siudzinski stated that a couple of different drawings at once would be helpful.

Mr. Yeager moved to adjourn the meeting at 6:45 p.m., was seconded by Ms. Siudzinski and carried unanimously.

Submitted by: 
Jennifer Mulligan
Stenographer

Approved by:
Michael Lane
Chairman