

**Town of Elkton
Elkton Historic District Commission
February 28, 2018**

PRESENT: Paula Newton, Chair; Brian Morgan; Brittany Schwartz; Will Whiteman; Jeanne D. Minner, Director of Planning; John Downs Esq., Legal Counsel

ABSENT: Jonathan Pugh

Ms. Newton called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM and stated that this is a meeting of the Historic District Commission and that a quorum was present. She stated that the Commission operates under the authority granted it by the Town of Elkton. She further stated that the qualifications of the Commission members are on file with the Town of Elkton. The basis of the decisions of the Commission be consistent with the Town's Ordinances, they are on file with the Town of Elkton and are hereby made a part of the record of each and every action of the Commission at today's meeting. Each application heard today is considered on its own merits and is not to be considered as establishing a precedent for any other application.

Ms. Newton stated that the first item on the agenda was approval of the minutes from the January 31, 2018 meeting. She asked if any member had any corrections. She stated that on the second page, second paragraph Mr. Vasquez's name needed correction. Hearing no further corrections, she asked for a motion.

MOTION: Mr. Morgan made a motion to approve as corrected. Mr. Whiteman seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Newton introduced the second item on the agenda.

Decision regarding request by Alberto and Heather Vasquez, representing Vasquez Construction, for a demolition and reconstruction at 260 W. Main Street, Elkton, which was tabled at the January 31, 2018 meeting.

Ms. Vasquez introduced herself and her husband, Alberto, to the Commission and stated that she was before them this evening for the decision regarding their request for the demolition and reconstruction of the duplex dwelling located at 260-262 W. Main Street, Elkton.

Ms. Newton noted that there was no one from the public in attendance and stated that, therefore, they would proceed to any questions and/or discussion from the Commission.

Ms. Newton summarized an article Ms. Minner had printed regarding the construction of plank buildings and their general uses.

Mr. Downs summarized what he felt the Commission was considering this evening. He noted that the application stated that the applicant was applying for approval of the demolition of 260-262 W. Main Street and that the reconstruction would be under another application.

Ms. Minner stated that the request was advertised for the demolition and reconstruction of the property.

Mr. Downs stated that the request was then for the demolition and reconstruction.

Mr. Morgan stated that after visiting the site and seeing the condition of the property, he would be able to support the applicant's goal of demolishing and replacing the structure. He stated that he thought the question is more what type of documentation would be needed since it is a special structure.

Discussion ensued regarding what measures should be taken to document the original plank interior of the building and any materials that may be under the current siding. It was agreed that it would be interesting to retain documentation of how the original building was constructed.

Mr. Whiteman said he too was inclined to agree to the request for demolition but with regard to the reconstruction he asked if the new building would be the same size, on the same footprint.

Mr. Vasquez stated that was correct. He stated that they are limited to a replacement of the same size, on the same footprint by Zoning Ordinance regulations.

Ms. Newton asked whether or not they should have two (2) separate motions, one to address the demolition request and another to address the reconstruction request.

Discussion ensued regarding possible scenarios where the request for demolition was approved and the applicants failed to follow through on reconstruction.

Ms. Minner stated that there should be two (2) separate motions.

Ms. Newton requested a motion addressing the demolition request.

MOTION: Mr. Morgan made a motion to approve the demolition of the building contingent upon photographic documentation being kept during all phases of demolition including but not limited to structural measurements in the photographs, details of the plank wall construction, any materials under the current siding and any other unique detail that might be uncovered during demolition. Mr. Whiteman seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Newton opened the floor to discussion and questions regarding the reconstruction of the duplex at 260-262 W. Main Street.

Ms. Newton stated that when the applicant's rehabilitated the adjacent house, they kept some of the Victorian details on the front of the house so that it would blend in with the other homes on the street.

Mr. Whiteman asked if the rendering provided by the applicant for the new construction showed a porch.

Ms. Minner stated that it did not.

After discussion, it was decided that a porch should be added to the structure to make it more compatible with the existing homes in the neighborhood. Members of the Commission agreed that they would need to see more detailed renderings of the proposed replacement building.

MOTION: Mr. Whiteman made a motion to table the Commission's decision on the reconstruction contingent upon the applicant providing renderings showing details that will make the structure more compatible with the existing homes in the neighborhood, including but not limited to providing a front porch. Mr. Morgan seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

New Business: Ms. Minner explained Mr. Ellis Rollins, Esq. request to restore the yardarm sign to his front lawn but with a sign advertising a new business at that location. She asked whether or not the Commission felt he would need to present before them.

Ms. Newton enumerated other similar situations where the owners were required to present to the Commission.

It was decided that Mr. Rollins should make a formal application and presentation to the Commission for the sign.

Ms. Minner provided information regarding proposed work at 111 E. High Street. She stated she did not feel that the work warranted a presentation before the Commission but wanted to hear the view of the Commission.

Discussion ensued regarding situations where a decision might be made by the Commission without the applicant appearing before them and making a formal presentation.

MOTION: Ms. Newton made a motion that, after reviewing the material provided by Ms. Minner regarding 111 E. High Street, the proposed work was more of replacement than renovation, was not visible from the street and, therefore, did not necessitate a formal presentation before the Commission. Mr. Whiteman seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Old Business: Ms. Minner stated that she spoke with Mr. Crouse and he has agreed to paint the handicap ramp on the side of his building.

Discussion ensued regarding the future of the Armory Building.

MOTION: Mr. Morgan made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Whiteman seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.