

**Historic District Commission
MINUTES**

**December 7, 2017
City of Hagerstown, Maryland**

Michael Gehr, chair, called the meeting to order at 4:30 p.m. on Thursday, December 7, 2017, in the Conference Room, Fourth Floor, City Hall. A roster of the members of the commission and the technical posts they fill are on file and available upon request. Also present were commission members L. Allen, C. Crumrine, C. Davis, S. Kreiger, S. Silas, and M. Wertman. S. Bockmiller, Development Planner and Zoning Administrator; and D. Calhoun, Secretary, were present on behalf of the Planning and Code Administration Department.

The chair asked for a motion to move Case No. HDC 2017-50 further down on the agenda (below the first workshop) to coincide with the workshop for that case.

MOTION: (Davis/Silas) So moved.
DISCUSSION: None.
ACTION: APPROVED (Unanimous)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

November 7, 2017.

MOTION: (Wertman/Allen) Move to approve.
DISCUSSION: None.
ACTION: APPROVED (Unanimous)

CONSENT AGENDA

907 Hamilton Boulevard – Mt. Aetna Restoration/Jack Hall – Deck, Case No. HDC 2017-46.

911 Potomac Avenue – Mt. Aetna Restoration/Jack Hall – Replace Carport Roof, Case No. HDC 2017-48.

931 Hamilton Boulevard – Vicki Knill – Replace Garage Door and Roof, Case No. HDC 2017-49.

No one was present in opposition to or had any questions about this case.

MOTION: (Davis/Allen) Mr. Chairman, I have reviewed the materials submitted in Cases HDC 2017-46, 907 Hamilton Boulevard; HDC 2017-48, 911 Potomac Avenue; and HDC 2017-49, 931 Hamilton Boulevard, and their associated staff reports and recommendations, and I have viewed the

properties in question. The staff reports recommend approval of these applications as consistent with the applicable standards adopted by this commission, and no one has appeared at this hearing with concerns about, issues with, or objections to these applications. Therefore, I move that this commission adopt the staff evaluations and recommendations in these cases as its own and grant Certificates of Appropriateness to the applicants for the previously mentioned cases.

DISCUSSION: None.
ACTION: APPROVED (Unanimous)

DESIGN REVIEW

One North Potomac Street – Baer Signs, Signs, Case No. HDC 2017-47.

Michael McIntyre, 8130 Tomstown Road, Waynesboro, Pennsylvania, was present on behalf of the owner.

Staff Report: This property is a B resource in the Downtown Local Historic District. Applicant is proposing to install two 20 x 120-inch aluminum signs with vinyl lettering in the signage areas above the storefronts. Signs shall be centered above the storefront windows. The signs will have a white background with blue and black lettering. Staff recommended approval and that the sign facing Washington Street be centered above the two middle panes of the display window. This area is bisected by a piece of vertical trim wood. Therefore, to lay on top of this piece, a comparable piece shall be installed on each end so as not to create a pocket behind the sign.

Applicant/Commission Discussion: Mr. McIntire provided a revised drawing showing the sign centered as requested by staff. Mr. Bockmiller noted two signs that have been placed in the windows that need to be approved by HDC. One is an electronic message sign and that has implications beyond the Historic District Commission. Mr. McIntyre stated that the tenant installed those signs and he noticed them too. Mr. McIntyre believed the fill board will add a finished touch to the project.

MOTION: (Wertman/Davis) Mr. Chairman, I have inspected the project plans and the property in question, and if constructed in accordance with these plans by inserting pieces of wood behind the sign so it is flush and nothing can get behind it, the project is compatible with the character of the district for the reasons that it will match everything around it, and it will be generally in harmony with the Architectural Design Guidelines for the Downtown Historic District and the character of the adjoining properties. Therefore, I move that the HDC grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to the applicant for Case No. 2017-47.

DISCUSSION: None.
ACTION: APPROVED (Unanimous)

WORKSHOP

37 South Prospect Street – Ed Tovornik.

Mr. Bockmiller stated that this property has been converted into condominiums. The total number of permitted units on this property is 13; however, the City approved taking some of the existing units and moving them to the carriage house in the back and a smaller house known as the Cottage. The number of units is not changing; only where they are located. Most of the units in the main building have been completed. Mr. Tovornik added that work on the wing stopped with mechanical work. Nothing has been done to the stone cottage except for gutting it and nothing has been done to the carriage house.

Mr. Tovornik is proposing changes from the original approval. A small porch will be added to the cottage and a second story is being proposed to the elevations of carriage house over the one-story portion on the south side. Mr. Tovornik is looking for guidance mostly on the carriage house. In addition, Mr. Tovornik enclosed some of the porches on the wing of the main building and is looking for retroactive approval of that work. Mr. Tovornik said he is adding a kitchen nook and at the end a study/bedroom area. The enclosures will not extend beyond the footprint of the porch. The units are less than 1,000 square feet and they are trying to add more floor space.

Ms. Wertman questioned what the materials will be for the enclosures. Mr. Tovornik stated that he will be using fiber cement with a natural grain and casement windows in the kitchen nook.

Concerning the wing, Ms. Allen questioned what would prevent porches from being added after the existing porches are closed in. Mr. Bockmiller said there is nothing to prevent them from adding porches or additions, but any such exterior changes would have to be reviewed by HDC. Ms. Allen asked if there would be any limits on footprint coverage. Mr. Bockmiller stated that the Board of Zoning Appeals may need to act on an expansion of a nonconforming use in the case of a horizontal addition, but they would not be expanding the use per se. Commission members had no concerns with the proposal for the ell/wing.

Commission members had no concerns with the proposal for the cottage. Mr. Bockmiller noted there is a door six or seven feet above the ground so there was probably a porch there at one time. The new porch will be in keeping with the roof line to catch the rain. Visibility from public ways will be obscured. Mr. Gehr noted that the plans do not show the railing; the window to the bottom and a portion of the doorway will be more obscured by the rail.

Two of the units currently in the main house will be moved to the carriage house. Extensive changes are needed to make the building habitable. Mr. Bockmiller said the existing one-story section has little architectural value. The only portion of the carriage house that retains any real historic merit is the two-story brick portion. The proposed work will cut into the brick wall on the north side to create windows. On the east elevation, adding a second floor, no particular issue. It

is aggressive and busy. Most of it is of no real historic value. Mr. Tovornik stated that the roof will not be rebuilt.

The existing one-story structure will be removed; the main structure is sound enough and can be salvaged. The siding will be cement fiber board. Some garage panels will be incorporated into the house design. Mr. Bockmiller asked if there will be any windows on south and west facades. Mr. Tovornik stated that there will be a small window in the brick wall (west façade). There will be a firewall that goes down the middle of the carriage house which will use a duplex design.

Commission members had no concerns with the materials selections. Mr. Tovornik told the commission that the new brick will have a handmade look and will be very similar to the existing brick. Stone portions will be four inches thick and the stone will be very similar to the stone used on the cottage. Mr. Bockmiller cautioned about the type of brick to be used. When the windows are put in, some of that brick could be salvaged for repair work.

Ms. Kreiger asked for clarification on the windows on the carriage house. The main building has six-over-six windows but the carriage house windows are different. Mr. Tovornik said he could do six-over-six windows. The stone cottage windows are in good shape, and he planned on keeping them. His original plan was going to have the windows on the two rear buildings match and the cottage windows are one-over-one.

DESIGN REVIEW - Continued

13-15-17 West Antietam Street – Downtown Arts & Entertainment Act 2, LLC – Demolition, Case No. HDC 2017-51.

Jeff Tedrick and Daniel Hockman of Bowman Development Corp, 10228 Governor Lane Boulevard, Suite 3002, Williamsport, Maryland, were present on behalf of the applicant.

Staff Report: This application is a request for the demolition of the rear section of the “Barnwood Books” building complex (the bare brick section of the westernmost portion of the building). The bare brick area is a B Resource. This building was constructed in three stages, the oldest being the section at the corner of Antietam and Potomac (which is an A resource). The masonry end wall of the remaining building will be patched where necessary and openings and framed sections will be filled with frame fill and rot resistant T-111, painted a neutral color. The footprint will be filled and graveled as a temporary measure.

Staff recommended approval of this application. Staff has been aware that this section of the building has been in deplorable condition for many years and the structure has been compromised. The submitted materials have been reviewed by the City’s Chief Code Official and he concurs that this section of the building cannot be rehabilitated with the reuse justifying the investment. A previous owner removed some of the floor joists which created structural problems.

This site and adjacent site that contained an apartment building that was demolished by order of the Chief Code Official after a fire are under common ownership. The applicants were encouraged to bring additional documentation to the meeting. Although staff has not been approached with any overture about use of the site subject to this application, the owner may approach the city with an application in the near future to use this area for a staging area for the construction of the expansion of the Barbara Ingram School. If that use does not occur, the site should be chained to prevent casual use of the gravel area for parking, etc.

Boarding the window openings and gravel adjacent to and visible from public ways are not acceptable long-term conditions in a historic district. Staff recommended that the HDC impose a condition that the applicant return to the HDC within 18 months with a plan for the treatment of the side of the remaining building, the site, and the graveled adjacent lot. That plan should be implemented within 30 months of this approval.

Mr. Bockmiller read into the record comments received from the commission's Architectural Historian, Dr. Paula Reed (copy in the meeting file). Dr. Reed generally did not have concerns with the demolition; however, demolition should be done so that it does not compromise the adjacent building.

Applicant/Commission Discussion: Dan Hockman stated that Mr. Bockmiller asked for and additional breakdown on what a rebuild would generate per floor (based on first floor retail commercial and three apartments each on the upper floors). The original calculations have not changed. It will be difficult to renovate or rebuild and still make a profit. Mr. Gehr noted that there are currently two units per floor. Mr. Hockman said no plans now for the site; however, there could be development in 30 months.

Mr. Tedrick said the previous owner removed portions of the floor to install an elevator or a stairway which compromised the building. Ms. Wertman stated that it was her understanding that there needed to be plan to rebuild within 24 months. Mr. Bockmiller clarified that it is not a requirement to do develop the site. The applicant is applying under the premise that the building is a hazard in general, however, it is bad enough that it cannot be saved. Mr. Tedrick said there is a long-term vision. Rob Faree spoke to the long-term vision.

The market does not support the type of revenue this project needs to generate to see it come to fruition (a combination of mixed-use retail, condominiums, and high-end residential). What has prompted this request is the condition of the building, but at the same time there will be a period of two years where a staging area will be needed to decrease the impact on downtown due to construction projects on South Potomac Street.

Ms. Allen asked if the Building Inspector found the building to be an imminent threat. Mr. Bockmiller said no, but he also has not attempted to inspect it.

Staff put on the record that, given the circumstances, the material presented was acceptable to justify demolition. If they come in later for the remaining building, including the A resource, the application will need to be much more comprehensive. Concerning whether or not there is any architectural elements inside the building worth salvaging, Mr. Gehr recalled that there was no elaborate trimwork to save. Mr. Bockmiller questioned whether there was evidence of window openings on the west side in the white building. Mr. Hockman stated that he has not seen window openings and the walls appear to be plastered. There is a definite seam/separation between the buildings.

MOTION: (Kreiger/Wertman) Mr. Chairman, I have inspected the project plans and the property in question, and if demolished in accordance with these plans and the use of retaining the west wall of the yellow and white building that is adjacent to it the project is compatible with the character of the district for the reasons that it is not structurally intact and is a safety hazard to the community and, therefore, I move that the HDC grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to the applicant for Case No. 2017-51.

DISCUSSION: Ms. Allen asked that the motion be amended to reflect the economic hardship of the underlying cost to support a renovation would be far below what could be recovered compared to new construction. Ms. Davis asked that the staff recommendation for the applicant returning within 18 months as indicated in the report. The motioner and seconder agreed to the amendments.

ACTION: APPROVED (Unanimous)

Mr. Tedrick informed the commission about Bowman's plans for the Masonic Temple building on South Potomac Street. Progress on this project can be viewed on Bowman's website. Mr. Tedrick is interested in finding the original floor plans for the building. Mr. Bockmiller suggested he contact the Masons directly because they may have the plans in their archives.

58 South Potomac Street – MSB Architects – Temporary Canopy, Case No. HDC 2017-50 and Workshop for Proposed Addition.

Scott Bowen, MSB Architects, 1165 Imperial Drive, Suite 208, Hagerstown, Maryland, was present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Bowen asked for a workshop concerning two stories of renovation on the East Antietam Street side of the building. The proposal will add approximately 2,000 square feet on four floors. The new addition will replace the existing beer garden. On the basement level the goal is to create a rathskeller or basement restaurant area that is more like a pub. The current bar is small and is located in the pathway used by the servers. The owner wants a more traditional bar. The main level will not change substantially.

This project will be done in at least three phases. Phase 1 is the canopy; Phase 2 involves moving the kitchen slightly; Phase 3 includes the back expansion. Mr. Bowen explained the internal changes and circulations that will occur with the alterations. An elevator will be part of the renovations. As a result of the beer garden being removed, the addition will move windows forward to allow more air and light into the building. On the upper floor there will be an additional apartment besides the existing apartments (which will stay where they are).

Concerning the canopy, the owner needs a temporary canopy out front for the nine months that the building will be under construction. This will be the primary dining area so no seating is lost. The application before the commission is for approval of the temporary canopy. It will be a vinyl canopy with large window panels. Sections of the canopy will roll up to allow open air dining on nice days. At the end of construction or once the first floor renovations are complete the canopy would be removed.

There may be a sidewalk cut on the Antietam Street side for basement access, however, that will require approval of a license agreement by the Mayor and City Council.

Materials on the dormers will be cement siding. Mr. Bockmiller noted that the original building is fairly historic having been constructed early in the 19th century. The back portion was probably constructed in the early 20th century. Mr. Bowen stated that they would like to remove the fire escape located on the roof of the front façade and staff did not have an objection to that proposal.

Mr. Bowen said they hope to come back to the commission in January or February for approval of the addition with construction beginning in March. The commission had no concerns with the materials presented for workshop (addition along East Antietam Street).

Applicant/Commission Discussion: Mr. Gehr asked how the canopy area will be heated and snow loads. Mr. Bowen said the canopy is designed with snow in mind. Mr. Gehr cautioned that when the canopy is installed the attachments to the building should not damage the façade, including the brick and leaded glass. Commission members had no additional concerns with the canopy application.

A copy of the staff report is in the meeting file for approval of the canopy on the front facade. Staff recommended approval for a period of 270 days.

MOTION: (Wertman/Davis) Mr. Chairman, I have inspected the project plans and the property in question, and if constructed in accordance with these plans and if the temporary awning is up for nine months and then be taken down while the construction is going on the project is compatible with the character of the district and is generally in harmony with the Architectural Design Guidelines for the Downtown Historic District and the character of the adjoining properties. Therefore, I move that the HDC grant a Certificate of Appropriateness to the applicant for Case No. 2017-50.

DISCUSSION: None.
ACTION: APPROVED (Unanimous)

NEW BUSINESS

Election of Officers.

MOTION: (Crumrine/Allen) I'll make the motion to retain current officers.
DISCUSSION: None.
ACTION: APPROVED (Unanimous)

2018 Meeting Schedule.

MOTION: (Davis/Allen) So moved (to adopt the proposed schedule).
DISCUSSION: None.
ACTION: APPROVED (Unanimous)

OLD BUSINESS

- Ms. Allen questioned what the white material is above the canopy at 72 West Washington Street (Manny's Oriental Rugs). The canopy is in bad shape.
- Mr. Bockmiller informed commission members that the Board of Education has decided not to include the footbridge into their plans for the upcoming downtown improvements. Instead a fifth floor will be added above the new building at 19 South Potomac Street. The fifth floor will be set back 25 feet from the front which should make it invisible to pedestrian. The architect, Aaron House, provided a drawing for staff's review that proves it will not be visible. Also the fifth floor will extend to the existing rear wall. The design on the back had a punch-out space for the bridge which will be eliminated. Mr. Bockmiller asked if the commission was comfortable allowing staff to handle this change administratively if the fifth floor is truly not visible. HDC members agreed that staff could approve this change administratively. Ms. Allen asked whether the floor loads would be able to handle an additional floor. Mr. Bockmiller stated that the fifth floor was planned into the original drawings. Mr. Bockmiller will get detailed drawings with accurate and verifiable cross sections to make sure the added floor will not be visible.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Ms. Wertman reported that the inaugural Kris Kringle Market was a success . Twenty-two vendors participate and over 300 people attended. Two of the vendors sold out by 2:00 p.m. Overall the Main Street/Next-sponsored event was well received. The next event is planned for March. Some other events include Sweet Fest, Battle of the Bands, Crab Cook-Off).
- Mr. Crumrine informed the group that he will be taking a class that will require him to miss the January 25, February 8, February 22, and March 8 meetings.

ADJOURN

It was moved and seconded that the meeting adjourn (6:13 p.m.).

1/25/2018

Approved



Debra C. Calhoun – Secretary