

**Historic District Commission
MINUTES – Special Meeting**

**August 17, 2016
City of Hagerstown, Maryland**

Michael Gehr, chair, called the special meeting to order at 4:35 p.m. on Wednesday, August 17, 2016, 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 C. Crumrine, S. Silas, S. Taylor, and M. Wertman. S. Bockmiller and D. Calhoun, Secretary, were present on behalf of the Planning and Code Administration Department.

416 North Locust Street – Fence, Case No. HDC 2016-27.

The chair suggested that the case at 416 North Locust Street for a fence be moved to the Consent Agenda.

- MOTION:** (Crumrine/Wertman) So moved (to move Case No. HDC 2016-27 to the Consent Agenda).
DISCUSSION: None.
ACTION: APPROVED (Unanimous)

APPROVAL OF MINUTES – July 28, 2016:

- MOTION:** (Wertman/Crumrine) I move we adopt them.
DISCUSSION: None.
ACTION: APPROVED (Unanimous)

CONSENT AGENDA

**416 North Locust Street – Susan Cook/Tri County Fence & Decks – Fence,
Case No. HDC 2016-27.**

There were no questions or concerns by the commission or members of the audience.

- MOTION:** (Wertman/Crumrine) Mr. Chairman, I have inspected the project plans and the property in question, and if constructed in accordance with these plans with the project is compatible with the character of the district, for the reasons that the materials in harmony with the Architectural Design Guidelines for the Residential preservation design 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. HDC 2016-27.
DISCUSSION: None.
ACTION: APPROVED (Unanimous)

(Mr. Silas arrived.)

DESIGN REVIEW

821 Potomac Avenue – William Van Gilder – Alterations, Case No. HDC 2016-26.

Bill Van Gilder, 12634 Clermont Avenue, Blue Ridge Summit, Pennsylvania, was present.

Staff Report: This building is a “B” resource in the Oak Hill Local Historic District and was damaged by a fire several years ago. Applicant replaced all the historic wood windows with vinyl one-over-one windows. The garage door was replaced as well, including T1-11 infill boards above the garage door. A workshop was conducted on June 23 with the applicant. Commission members advised that the vinyl “stick-on” mullions could be used to recreate the appearance of the historic windows. The new windows are made by United Window, 800 Series. Mullion patterns proposed on the application are as follows:

- Second floor, east side (front): three-over-one.
- First floor, south side: six-over-one.
- Front left picture window: three-over-three.

The 9 x 7-foot garage door is ThermaStar by Pella, white, with no windows. The T1-11 boards approximately match the infill boards that were in place before the fire. Staff recommended approval for the replacement of all windows (even those without mullion issues), as long as the application is amended to reflect the discussion from the June 23 workshop concerning the window patterns, as follows:

- Second floor, east side (front) – double-hung, six-over-one.
- First floor, south side – double-hung, three-over-one.
- Front left picture window – three-over-three (although the discussion was not clear from the minutes).
- First floor, front left hopper window – use two vertical mullions on the top and bottom sashes to appear as a six-light window.
- The second hopper window at ground level – no change.
- Upper floor windows on the cross gables – no change.

Staff noted that the minutes of the workshop meeting do not give clear direction regarding the front first floor windows and may require clarification by the commission.

Applicant/Commission Discussion: Mr. Van Gilder said his understanding was that the three windows on the first floor, south side would be three-over-one; the hopper window would be three-over-three; and the side windows would be three-over-one. Mr. Bockmiller clarified that the hopper window is the window is to the left near ground level; the picture windows are on either side of the door. Mr. Van Gilder recalled that the commission said he could leave the picture

windows as they are because of their reduced visibility under the porch roof. Currently the picture windows are two sets of one-over-one windows on either side of the front door. Mr. Bockmiller commented that the original windows on either side of the door were single windows with leaded glass transoms. The applicant, commission members, and staff discussed the mullion configurations for the windows and agreed upon the following and Mr. Van Gilder agreed to amend his application accordingly:

- Second floor front – six-over-one.
- Bay window on the south side – three-over-one.
- Hopper window on the left front – two vertical grilles will be added on the top and bottom sashes to give the appearance of a 2 x 3 six-light window.
- Front picture windows – no change.
- Windows on the back and the sides that are not visible from public ways – no change.

MOTION: (Taylor/Wertman) 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 details are compatible with the style of home and are generally in harmony with the Architectural Design Guidelines for the Residential Preservation Design 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. 2016-26.

DISCUSSION: None.

ACTION: APPROVED (Unanimous)

WORKSHOP

86-98 West Washington Street – Ares Investment Group, LLC – Windows.

Ash and Mo Azadi were present on behalf of Ares Investment Group, LLC, owner of the Hamilton Hotel property.

Staff explained that the applicant is proposing to convert the Hamilton Hotel into a student housing facility for the University Systems of Maryland. One of the issues that have come up is the windows. Window samples were provided to staff last week (and were available for the commission to see at this meeting).

Both examples are casement windows. Casement windows have been approved by the commission in cases where there were issues with the Fire Code compliance but not as a first choice for window style as a replacement for double-hung windows. There is a variety of window shapes on this building, but most of them are two-over-twos. Mr. Bockmiller spoke with the

Planning Director about this matter. If the applicants are planning to use state funds for this project, the Maryland Historical Trust (MHT) will be reviewing their plans. The applicants stated that they are not planning to use state funds. All of the windows on the building would be replaced by the casement-style windows.

Staff asked the applicant what is the reason behind using casement windows instead of double-hung windows. M. Azadi stated that they cannot restore the windows and one of the biggest issues is time. They need to be finished for the first group of students by March-April 2017. There are 172 windows that must be replaced. Once they place the order, it will take 60 days to manufacture the custom-made windows since the existing windows are not standard sizes. Mr. Gehr was concerned about the size of some of the windows and whether casement windows would be a viable option for the larger windows.

According to staff, the Design Review application submitted for this case indicates that PVC windows will be used; however, these windows are also available in aluminum. Staff and the applicant have discussed ways in which to make the casements appear as double-hung windows. According to the applicants, the new windows will replicate the shape and style of the historic windows. The second floor windows are eight feet tall and commission members asked how those will be divided to simulate the historic windows. The windows will open toward the inside rather than opening out. A. Azadi stated that the aluminum windows are more expensive and in the long term are better than the PVC; however, in terms of energy efficiency, the PVC windows are better.

Mr. Gehr cautioned that when the case is being reviewed by the commission, the applicants need to have a model selected. Mr. Bockmiller stated that an important consideration will be how a casement-style window will blend in on a building that historically has had double-hung windows. The windows selected need to reflect the historic nature of the building. In the past the commission has allowed casement windows as an accommodation for a code issue. The applicants stated that only the window will be removed, the frames will remain (and will be painted). The new windows will be tinted with full screens. Because the casement windows will open differently than the existing double-hung windows, the appearance of the window will be lost when it is open.

M. Azadi stated that every door and every window will be replaced. The third and fourth floors must be complete by March. Initially there will be 24 student apartments. Phase II call for an additional 16 units for a total of 40 student housing units. Modifications to the main entrance will be submitted for approval under a separate application. Staff advised the applicant to find a double-hung product in case the HDC has issues with the casement windows. Mr. Gehr stated that typically the maximum size for casement windows is 4 x 5 feet and the applicants may want to verify with the manufacturer that the sizes needed for this project are available.

Ms. Taylor asked for clarification on why double-hung windows are not being considered. M. Azadi stated that the manufacturer does not make double-hung windows out of PVC.

Mr. Gehr stated that many of the residential windows are no longer made in the “widths” anymore due to current code requirements (wind loads, etc.).

M. Azadi asked for feedback from the commission on whether the casement windows would be approvable. Staff pointed out the issue of visibility. There are two street frontages and a portion of the back of the building is visible from Jonathan Street. There are facades on this building that are not visible or minimally visible from public ways. These windows may not even need to have muntins. Commission members said the windows that are visible from West Washington Street, Jonathan Street, and Summit Avenue would be of the most concern.

Ms. Wertman said she did not have an issue with the casement windows, as long as they approximate the historic windows. Mr. Silas questioned how these windows will meet the Fire Code if they only open eight inches. Mr. Gehr said the window will need to have the ability to open wider for emergency egress purposes. Ms. Wertman pointed out this would only be an issue with the six windows that would have opened onto balconies (on the second floor).

Mr. Bockmiller pointed out there are block panels in those former balcony door openings, so the new windows in these locations will probably be a double-hung window on top of it. Mr. Gehr did not have any objection to the casement windows, as long as they can replicate the double- or single-hung windows that are being replaced, however, he advised the applicants to document why the use of casement in lieu of double-hung should be permitted.

Mr. Bockmiller stated at the next meeting, the applicants should be prepared to discuss the size and width of the faux muntins, given the size of the windows being replaced. The windows on the Hamilton Hotel are bigger than the windows where casements were used on the Patterson building. He reiterated that it might be worthwhile to have a double-hung product picked out just in case the HDC has an issue with approval of the casement windows since time is of the essence with this project. Mr. Gehr asked if the window thickness the same or very similar to the actual two sashes. M. Azadi said yes, 99.9% is the same, although the proposed windows are energy efficient, double-glazed so they will be somewhat different.

261 South Prospect Street – City of Hagerstown – Front Door.

Terry Irwin was present on behalf of the City of Hagerstown.

Mr. Bockmiller explained that this building was purchased by the City of Hagerstown. Previously it was a four-unit apartment building; however, he speculated that it was originally built as a single-family residence. The City is contemplating selling the building as a side-by-side duplex. The location of the proposed line of subdivision would run along the side of the bay window. A new front door for the left unit would need to be installed. There are two options: one would be to remove the right-most existing window on the bay and create an entry door that accesses the front porch; the second would be to build a second porch on the left side and create an entry door off of the new porch, however, the setbacks are tight along the adjacent property. The preference would

be to create the entry door off the existing porch. Mr. Gehr suggested creating a dual entrance in the existing door with a shared vestibule.

Mr. Bockmiller said staff's position is that the ideal way to handle this would be to preserve the front façade of the building, put a very simple porch on the left side with steps that tie down to grade behind the turnback of the bay window. That way the new construction will not impact the front façade of the building and new doors are not being created on the primary façade.

Mr. Irwin noted that the existing closed in porch on the back will be replaced with stairwells and half baths. His plan for the porch would be a small, sympathetic open air or simple porch with a small overhang over the door. Mr. Bockmiller stated that because the porch would be a new feature, the Design Guidelines recommend that the new porch be "a product of its own time." The new porch should not look like it was built when the house was built but complement the existing architecture. Commission members and staff discussed the interior configuration of the building and whether the house was originally a single-family or a duplex.

Mr. Irwin stated that if one of the doors is relocated to create a side entrance into the unit on the south side or off the porch, they plan to eliminate one of the existing front door openings and close in the opening with a window and brick infill. Mr. Gehr suggested using a wood panel below the window, which would still show there was a door in that location at one time. In answer to a question by Mr. Silas, Mr. Bockmiller stated that the City purchased this property in attempt to stabilize the neighborhood. The property has been vacant long enough that the nonconforming use status as a four-unit apartment building has expired. Apartment buildings are not a permitted use in the RMED (Residential-Medium Density) zoning district. Based on the amount of money the City has put into this property, it is not financially advantageous to convert the building to single-family. Because some state grant money is being used to fund this project, if it is a two-unit building one of the units needs to be income eligible.

Concerning replacement windows on the front, Mr. Irwin stated that based on discussions with Mr. Bockmiller they would be using wood windows, and on the sides and the rear would be vinyl windows. Mr. Bockmiller stated the windows on the building now are replacement one-over-one windows; however, the building was built in 1905 and one-over-one and two-over-two windows would have been common. Mr. Crumrine said he thought the one-over-one windows look fine. Mr. Gehr added unless there is photodocumentation to the contrary. Mr. Gehr thought future homeowners would rather have either wood windows or vinyl windows but not a mixture. Mr. Bockmiller clarified with Mr. Irwin whether the Maryland Historical Trust (MHT) would be reviewing the plans because of the state funding involved. The MHT may have concerns about the vinyl windows even on the back and sides of the property. Mr. Irwin asked if the door in the new opening needs to be a wood door or could it be an architecturally significant steel or fiberglass material. Mr. Bockmiller said the doors would be evaluated separately since one is on the front and the other could possibly be on the side of the building that does not face one-way traffic. Doors on the front façade would be held to stricter requirements than a door on the side façade. Mr. Gehr stated that you can get doors with raised panels in steel or fiberglass and did not

see it as an issue. The MHT may have concerns about modern materials for the doors. MHT may also have an issue with relocating one of the doors to the side of the building. MHT does offer preliminary consultations on matters such as these.

Most commission members' preference was to have the new entry door on the side façade. Mr. Gehr said his opinion would be based on how the porch or the indoor arrangement is set up, he could go several ways, depending on the overall appearance. There is a fairly ornate front on the building and nice entry on one side. Based on the discussion there could be a "block" entry on the side façade. He would need to see a plan with the new porch design. Regardless, if there is state money involved, the Maryland Historical Trust will have the final say. Mr. Irwin said he will pursue a preliminary consultation with MHT and then come back to the commission after he has met with the state.

NEW BUSINESS

None.

OLD BUSINESS

Certified Local Government Annual Report. Staff requested that commission members who have not done so already, to pass along any training that members have completed between July 1, 2015 and June 30, 2016.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

None.

ADJOURN

It was moved and seconded that the meeting adjourn (5:52 p.m.).

8/25/2016

Approved



Debra C. Calhoun – Secretary