



City of Hagerstown, Maryland  
Committed to Safety  
Dedicated to Partnership and Progress

## **MINUTES - HAGERSTOWN HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

**Date:** October 28, 2021  
**Time:** 4:30 p.m.  
**Location:** City Council Chambers, Second Floor, City Hall, 1 East Franklin Street  
**Attendance:**

<b>Name</b>	<b>In-Person</b>	<b>Remote</b>	<b>Absent</b>
Michael Gehr, Chairperson	X		
Leslie Allen, Vice Chairperson	X		
Robert Powell			X
W. Douglas Carroll	X		
Christopher George	X		
Matthew Chilton			X
Vacancy	-	-	-
Staff and Ex-Officio Members:			
S. Bockmiller, Development Review Planner and Zoning Administrator	X		
A. Haught, Recording Secretary	X		

### **Preliminary Matters -**

- 1. Call to Order and Instructions from the Chair** - The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 4:42 p.m. Attendance of members and staff are reflected in the chart above. The Chair read the standard instructions to applicants regarding order of business into the record.
- 2. Approval of Minutes** – None.

### **Application Review -**

- 1. Consent Agenda** – The Commission agreed to the following case being approved on consent motion:  
 HDC 2021-36 - 115 W. Washington Street – Simin Azadi – Grant approval for repairs to rear of building and approval of a projecting sign.  
 HDC 2021-38 - 441 N. Potomac Street – TMG Studios – Sign.

**Action:** (Carroll/George): Mr. Chairman, I have reviewed the materials submitted in Case No. HDC 2021-36 and HDC 2021-38, and their associated staff reports and recommendations, and I have viewed the properties in question. The staff reports recommend approval of this application 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 cases HDC 2021-36 and HDC 2021-38. There being no further discussion, the motion was **approved** by a vote of 4-0.

### **2. Reviews -**

**HDC 2021-37 – David McGinley – 1002 Oak Hill Avenue - Fence.** The staff report, which is in the meeting file, was presented by Mr. Bockmiller. The Applicant was present. Mr. Bockmiller explained that the fence meets the Design Guidelines in appearance, but is to be made of vinyl which is not listed as a preferred material for fences in the historic districts. Staff provided photos of the site showing the configuration of the site and existing vegetation as related to the adjacent side street (the property is a corner lot).

Staff explained that the only reason why the application did not go on consent agenda is because the material proposed is vinyl. Mr. McGinley stated that vinyl was proposed for maintenance purposes, and would be set a distance 8 feet back from the side street and new vegetation has replaced the old vegetation previously existing along the side street and they expect it to grow together and be a solid green wall in about four years, so after a while, it won't be seen and its appearance as vinyl will be a temporary problem and more vegetation will be planted in the area where the end post of the fence near the alley and side street will be located.

**Action:** (Carroll/Allen): Mr. Chairman, I have inspected the project plans and the property in question, and if constructed in accordance with these plans, the project is compatible with the character of the district for the reasons that the applicant has already planted landscaping and there will be more planting and is in general harmony with the Architectural Design Guidelines for the Residential Historic Districts and the character of the adjoining properties. Therefore, I move that the HDC **grant** a Certificate of Appropriateness to the Applicant for Case No. HDC 2021-37. There being no further discussion, the motion was **approved** by a vote of 4-0.

### 3. Consultations and Workshops -

**Shockey Building Renovation and Addition – East Side Summit Avenue.** The applicant was represented by architect Adam Carballo and property owner Ash Azadi. They plan to renovate the Shockey Building and demolish the building to the south in order to construct an addition to the Shockey Building. When asked by the Commission about the building to be demolished, Mr. Bockmiller explained that the building was constructed as a house and is shown on the resource map as a B Resource, however, the building has been changed and modified so many times it retains little if its historic integrity, and given its location, no one would ever buy the property to restore it to its former residential use and appearance. Mr. Bockmiller also explained an email evaluating the situation provided by the Architectural Consultant (Dr. Reed). Staff's only comments are that the projecting "Shockey" sign on the front of the existing building is part of the historic character of the building and dates to at least the early 1940s. Also, with as many dwelling units that are being proposed with no balconies, the applicant should look at providing a rooftop deck to provide outdoor open space area for the residents of the building.

Mr. Carballo explained that the renovated and expanded building will contain first floor commercial in the existing building, with the rest of the building and all of the addition being fitted out for 39 dwelling units. They intend to restore the existing front façade to original appearance. They desire to connect the second floor of the building to the proposed Antietam Street parking deck. The roof would either be developed as an amenity area for residents of the building or something like an open-air tavern to serve stadium traffic.

Ms. Allen asked about the development process that would be involved in developing the property (site plan, subdivision plat and HDC review), and about the existing condemned status of the building. The Commission generally was not opposed to the demolition for the purpose of constructing the new addition, given its compromised historic status and the extreme unlikelihood that it would ever be restored to its former appearance, but advised that a property history report should be completed by a qualified professional prior to approval of a demolition. The Commission was concerned with the banks of three windows in the addition – that the center units of each should be removed to more reflect the fenestration pattern on the existing building.

### 4. Historic District Commission Business -

None.

### Adjournment:

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:38 p.m.



for Amy Haught, Recording Secretary