**LAYTONSVILLE HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Monday, March 19, 2018**

**Present:**

Lisa Simonetti, Chair

Andy Drouliskos

Charles Hendricks

Jill Ruspi

Michele Shortley

**Absent:**

Susan Phillips, Alternate

**Attendees:**

Jim Ruspi, Mayor

Jennifer Sizemore, Secretary

Ann Fitts and Bill Fitts, St. Bartholomew’s Church

**Opening:**

Chair Simonetti called the meeting to order at 7:08 p.m. and read the mission statement. She noted that a quorum was present.

**Minutes:**

Member Hendricks made a motion to approve the February meeting minutes, Member Ruspi seconded, all approved.

**New Business:**

HDWP 02-18: 21611 Laytonsville Road, St. Bartholomew’s Episcopal Church: The church needs to replace the roof and is requesting permission to remove the chimney permanently. Mr. Fitts explained that the chimney is unstable and is a safety and property damage risk. The Historic District Commission (HDC) members looked at the roof and chimney. Mr. Fitts explained that the chimney is only visible from the back of the church and is not functional. In 1956, a cinderblock structure was added to the church with bathrooms and the furnace room was moved into the addition. Mr. Fitts he couldn’t determine from historical information whether the chimney was original.

The replacement of the roof is an urgent need. Mr. Fitts showed a shingle that had blown off the roof—it is worn down to almost nothing and has sharp edges. The plan is to replace the roof with S-1, the highest grade of slate shingle, which comes with a 100-year guarantee. All shingles will be replaced, including on the steeple. Member Hendricks asked whether there was a choice of colors, and Mr. Fitts said there are some choices, as well as some natural variation, and they tried to pick what they believe is the closest to the original. It may be a little darker due to fading of the current roof. They are also planning to use 3/8” shingles, which are heavier than the ¼” option. A church member is willing to help with the cost of the roof in memory of his wife. The church has contacted two contracting companies, both of which are very qualified and experienced in working on historical properties. They plan to select the most cost-effective option. Member Drouliskos asked whether the same contractor would replace the roof and remove the chimney, and Mr. Fitts said they would. Further, Mr. Fitts said any hole in the roof is prone to failure, especially over time, which is further argument not to rebuild the chimney. Member Drouliskos asked whether plywood would need to be replaced or other repairs made, and Mr. Fitts said the contractors don’t think so. The group discussed the size and placement of the shingles, which will be similar to the current roof, and how they would be mounted. Member Drouliskos asked whether the contractors have workman’s comp and liability insurance, and Mr. Fitts said they did. Member Ruspi suggested getting a copy of the insurance policy. Member Drouliskos asked how long the project would take. Mr. Fitts said it would be a couple of weeks. A scaffold would have to be set up first then the roofers could perform the work. There will be deck boards over all entrances, and the scaffold will be close to the building to ensure safety. Member Hendricks asked whether the flat roof on the addition will also be replaced, and Mr. Fitts said it would, using asphalt to match the current roof.

Regarding the chimney, Ms. Fitts said the furnace was installed in 1947 and the chimney was likely added then, though they don’t have specific documentation to confirm. She added that the chimney is unattractive and is not functional. Also, they plan to use the bricks and possibly the old slate from the roof within the planned garden. Member Drouliskos expressed concern about safety with the scaffolding and possible loose tiles. Mr. Fitts said the contractors would clean up on a daily basis, and he plans to be there each day during the project. Member Hendricks asked whether the church and driveway would be closed, and Mr. Fitts said the church would remain open, though the driveway may be closed on workdays (not Sundays). Member Drouliskos noted the lightening rod on the chimney, and Member Hendricks asked where it would be moved to. Mr. Fitts said he didn’t think it was needed anymore given that the chimney goes all the way to the ground and the steeple is wood. The commission members agreed that the chimney could be removed without compromising the historic aesthetics of the church. Member Hendricks moved to approve the application, Member Shortley seconded, and the motion was approved unanimously.

21606 Laytonsville Rd.: Member Shortley recused herself to discuss her application for an in-kind replacement of portions of her iron fence that were damaged by a fallen tree. She provided pictures of the damaged sections to be replaced and said the gate on both sides would need to be rewelded. The other gate has rusted and will be sand blasted. The new sections may be a darker shade of black, so they may need to paint the whole thing. They also plan to plant some new trees, perhaps a flowering tree and a Norway spruce. Member Ruspi asked about the age of the fallen tree, and Member Shortley said she didn’t know. Member Drouliskos asked whether the replacement pieces would be welded onsite, and Ms. Shortley said they would be made in the shop then brought to the house. Member Hendricks asked whether the estimate included the corroded posts. Ms. Shortley said it didn’t, and they may go with a simpler pattern in the back given that the panels are very expensive. Member Drouliskos asked about using hollow aluminum, and Ms. Shortley agreed it’s an option, but it’s less ornate. The committee members discussed whether an application was needed for in-kind replacements and decided to create a new form that residents can use to inform the committee about this type of work that doesn’t require approval.

**Old Business:**

6924 Sundown Road: Member Drouliskos has not yet had a chance to follow up with the homeowner. He needs to find out the date the original application was approved.

Member Ruspi moved to adjourn the meeting 8:27 p.m., Member Hendricks seconded, and the motion was unanimously approved.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Sizemore