

**Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission**  
**February 10<sup>th</sup>, 2022 Meeting Minutes**

**Call to order; introduction of Commission members; pledge of allegiance to the Flag; statement of purpose and operating procedures**

Mr. Holman, Chair, opened the regular monthly meeting of the Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) at 6:05 p.m. Through the meeting, the following Commission members were:

Present	Not Present
Ms. Phoebe Evans Letocha	Mr. Stephen Myer
Mr. John Holman	Ms. Marina Novaes
Mr. Scott Holupka	
Mr. Ed Hord	
Ms. Selisa Jefferson	
Mr. Vincent Johnson	
Ms. Wendy McIver	
Ms. Lili Mundroff	
Mr. Raymond Scott	
Mr. Christopher Weston	

Attending County staff included Ms. Caitlin Merritt (Preservation Services Chief), Ms. Taylor Bensley (Development Review Planner), and Ms. Jenifer Nugent (Development Review Chief).

Mr. Holman welcomed new Commissioner, Ms. Selisa Jefferson.

**1. Review of the Agenda**

Ms. Bensley reported no changes to the Preliminary Agenda published February 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2022.

**2. Approval of the Minutes**

Mr. Holman asked if anyone proposed changes to the January 13<sup>th</sup>, 2022 Minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Holman called for a motion on the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Weston moved to approve the Minutes as drafted. Ms. Evans Letocha seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. Jefferson, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

**3. Consent Agenda**

Ms. Bensley read the Action Recommendations for Consent Agenda Items 10, 11, 13, and 14.

Mr. Holman asked if anyone wished to discuss the Consent Agenda Items further. Hearing none, Mr. Holman called for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda items as proposed. Mr. Weston moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for each Consent Agenda item as proposed. Ms. Evans Letocha seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr.

Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. Jefferson, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

#### **Items for Discussion and Vote**

4. Waltemyer Property, 206 West Seminary Avenue, Lutherville; Contributing structure in the Lutherville County Historic District; MIHP # BA-343; Ex-post facto review of garage demolition without a permit and/or LPC review for Code Enforcement Correction Notice # CB2100502 [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Bensley introduced the agenda item, which involved ex post facto approval of the demolition of a detached garage, demolished August 6<sup>th</sup>, 2021. To begin, Ms. Bensley provided background on the property. The home was a shingled American Foursquare style home with Colonial Revival details, constructed around 1910; the detached garage was a frame, one-bay, single-story, wood shingle garage with a gable roof, likely built at the same time as the home or a few years later, and had a frame lean-to addition on its rear elevation. The garage was located at the end of the driveway to the right of the home and was visible from the public right of way. The property was sold at auction May 2019 to Mr. Carroll Waltemyer. At the time of the meeting, the property was up for sale and real estate photos available online showed it had been updated.

Ms. Bensley explained that the garage was demolished in August of 2021 following a storm in June of 2021. Community members alerted Historic Preservation staff to work and the structures demolition despite no razing permit and/or Commission review. She continued on that the Historic Review Application stated that a large tree fell on the property within the vicinity of the garage and emergency conditions and instability led to the demolition. She explained that photos of the garage before, during, and following the storm and demolition were included in the meeting materials.

Ms. McIver entered the meeting at 6:20 PM.

Mr. Holman welcomed the applicant and his team, which consisted of: Mr. Scott Breza of Hofmeister and Breza, the attorney for the project and applicant; Mr. William Castle, the representative of the property owner; Mr. James Bimstefer, the real estate agent that currently had the home listed for sale; and Mr. Jason Wood, the contractor the demolished the structure.

Mr. Breza explained that the owner, Mr. Carroll Waltemyer, purchased the home at foreclosure in April 2019 and, because of that, did not receive information on the historic designation of the home. He continued on that Mr. Waltemyer was 92 years old, suffering from advanced Parkinson's, and was under full time care. Mr. Waltemyer contacted Mr. Castle and asked him to get the property ready for sale; profits from the sale would be used for Mr. Waltemyer's full time, in house care. Mr. Breza then provided information on the demolition of the garage, citing that it was in poor condition, that no one could enter the garage to restore it prior to or following the storm because it was unstable and expected to fall at any moment, that repairs were not economically feasible, and that the demolition was an emergency.

Mr. Bimstefer, the real estate agent selling the home, testified that the garage was unstable and he would not go in it from the start for fear of collapse. He continued on that he did not believe the garage was historic and rather had been constructed in the 1950's because it was on a modern concrete slab and the wood was not from the 1910's. Mr. Bimstefer noted that he had concerns the garage would fall and crush the fence and/or cars located at 204 West Seminary Avenue.

Mr. Holman asked if Mr. Bimstefer, as a real estate agent, was aware the property was historic and proper disclosure was required. Mr. Bimstefer confirmed he was aware but that the garage was already falling down.

Ms. Mundroff asked if the structure was a shed or garage. Mr. Bimstefer explained that the front was a small garage, not large enough for a car, and that the back had, what appeared to be a chicken coop.

Mr. Wood, the contractor that demolished the structure, testified that the garage was neglected, in poor condition, growing mold, and did not appear historic.

Mr. Hord stated that the garage would not have had multiple, long lasting roofs visible had it not been old. Mr. Wood stated there was no underlayment.

Mr. Castle, the representative for the property owner, testified that he did not make the decision to demolish the garage lightly, but that it was necessary as the storm had shifted the building and he was concerned it would collapse or fall onto the neighbor's property. He noted that insurance advised him if the garage did fall or damage anything, his liability insurance would not cover the damage. Mr. Castle continued that the garage was supported on cement blocks, that the wood was rotten from weather, and that the garage was, overall, neglected and falling apart. He explained that he loved historic properties and took joy in accurately restoring them, but that there was no way to save the garage. Mr. Castle concluded his remarks by reiterating Mr. Breza's comments that the historic information was not disclosed because the home was a foreclosure.

Ms. Evans Letocha asked when the storm was. Mr. Castle stated it was in mid-June and that there had been a string of storms. She then asked why he did not contact Historic Preservation staff from June to August, to which Mr. Castle replied that he was not aware of the process.

Ms. Evans Letocha asked if there was an insurance claim. Mr. Castle confirmed there was and there was an ongoing report, however it had not been resolved. Mr. Breza noted that they could not obtain documentation, which is why no details were submitted.

Ms. Bensley informed Mr. Holman that four community members were signed up to speak: Ms. Marianne Wittelsberger, the previous owner; Ms. Marie Frederick, a neighbor and the head of Lutherville Advisory Committee; Mr. Charles Davis, the owner of the property behind the dwelling, 1508 Bellona Avenue; and Ms. Christine Hafnagl-Miller, the owner of 204 West Seminary, next to dwelling. She noted that each community member also submitted written testimony, which had been shared with the Commission.

Ms. Wittelsberger, the previous owner of the home, testified in opposition to the ex-post facto approval. She explained that Mr. Castle had visited the property prior to the sale and she had discussed the historic designation. She also explained that the garage was not in bad condition when she moved out, and that she used to store valuables, including her car, in it.

Ms. Frederick, a neighbor and member of the Lutherville Advisory Committee, testified in opposition to the ex-post facto approval. She stated that the realtor selling the property to Mr. Waltemyer should have made him aware of the designation. Additionally, she noted that Mr. Castle could have requested emergency approval from staff.

Mr. Davis, the owner of the property behind the dwelling, testified in opposition to the ex-post facto approval. He directed the Commission to photos submitted by the community that showed the garage was not unstable or shifted until after demolition began and would not have rolled onto the neighbor at 204 West Seminary Avenue's property if not demolished. Mr. Davis also noted that the tree did not fall directly on the garage, but rather just in the backyard.

Ms. Hafnagl-Miller, the next door neighbor at 204 West Seminary Avenue, testified in opposition to the ex-post facto approval. She explained that Mr. Castle never alerted her to concerns that the garage would damage her property and stated she was the one who informed Mr. Castle of the fallen tree, which was not on the garage.

Mr. Johnson entered the meeting at 6:45 PM.

Mr. Weston remarked that no evidence was presented documenting that the garage was not historic and that, even if it had been in poor condition, purchasing a property at auction assumes all of its issues. He stated that the owner should have done their due diligence and that the team was ignorant of the laws.

Mr. Weston moved to not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or a Notice to Proceed for the ex-post facto garage/shed demolition and to require the property owner to submit an application for rebuilding the garage (with complete elevation drawings) within 60 days (submit on or before April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2022) or have a Citation issued by Code Enforcement. Ms. McIver seconded the motion.

Mr. Hord stated that, based on the information provided, he believed the garage was historic and could have been repaired. He continued on that had it truly been an emergency, the owner would have said something to the neighbor and would not have waited two months to demolish the structure. Mr. Hord agreed with Mr. Weston that laws and rules were ignored and that there was no excuse.

Mr. Johnson asked if the structure was to be rebuilt as it was with the motion at hand. Mr. Hord confirmed it was. Mr. Holupka asked if that was for the entire structure or just the garage. Ms. Merritt stated that staff's recommendation was that the entire structure be rebuilt.

Mr. Breza stated that, given Mr. Waltemyer's age and health, it was possible the executor would be addressing the issues. He asked if it was okay if the property was sold prior to resolution of the Code violation. Ms. Merritt stated that the Code violation would stay with the property owner and that she would need to contact the County's Office of Law for further clarification.

Mr. Holman reminded the Commission of the motion on the floor – to not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or a Notice to Proceed for the ex-post facto garage/shed demolition and to require the property owner to submit an application for rebuilding the garage (with complete elevation drawings) within 60 days (submit on or before April 11<sup>th</sup>, 2022) or have a Citation issued by Code Enforcement – and called for a roll call vote. The motion passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Fences and Landscape: pages 1, 5; County Code Sec. 32-7-405, 32-7-403*

5. Chatsworth (Ross Property), 21 West Chatsworth Avenue, Reisterstown; Final Landmark # 74; MIHP # BA-972; Construction of steps for the smokehouse/dairy [County Council District # 2]

Ms. Bensley introduced the agenda item, which involved the construction of steps for the 2-story, brick and frame smokehouse/dairy at Chatsworth, an 1830's vernacular style home with some Greek revival details. She reminded the Commission that the proposal was reviewed at the January 2022 meeting but denied due to concerns that the drawings for the steps were a safety issue as drawn, that the steps would not meet Code as drawn, and that the step risers did not make sense. Ms. Bensley explained that the homeowner had revised the drawings to better show the proposed steps/landing, and that the drawings included a note that the steps would be constructed to Code.

Mr. Holman welcomed Mr. Jeffrey Ross, the homeowner.

Mr. Ross thanked the Commission for reviewing the work and offered to answer any questions.

Mr. Weston stated that the updated, revised drawings were an improvement from the drawings submitted for the January 2022 meeting.

Mr. Weston moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the work as proposed. Mr. Hord seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Porches and Steps: page 3; County Code Sec. 32-7-405*

6. Romay Property, 4817 Butler Road, Glyndon; Non-contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District; MIHP # BA-2498; Ex-post facto review of exterior signage for Code Enforcement Correction Notice # CB2100788 [County Council District # 2]

Ms. Bensley introduced the agenda item, which involved ex-post facto approval of a sign at 4817 Butler Road. She first explained the history of the structure itself. The structure was a two-story brick building constructed circa 1931 in the Colonial revival style with a historic, character defining, "Glyndon Bank" sign at the top. Additionally, Ms. Bensley noted that, although it was a non-contributing resource in the district, as it fell outside Glyndon's period of significance, which ended around 1915, the site had acquired significance on its own as a prominent building on Butler Road, the community's main thoroughfare, and had merit to be individually listed on the National Register or as a County Landmark. Ms. Bensley then provided information on the installed sign. She explained that the sign measured 144" x 20", was painted matte black metal with white lettering and the dentistry's logo, and was mounted to the mortar overtop the historic "Glyndon Bank" sign. Ms. Bensley noted that a sign from the previous owner, Dr. Jay Toth, previously existed below the historic "Glyndon Bank" sign, above the keystone.

Mr. Holman welcomed Dr. Leah Romay, the property owner.

Dr. Romay explained that she chose the location for the sign because it was the most prominent spot on the building to advertise her dental practice and she wanted the community, when driving along Butler Road, to know the practice existed. She continued that the current sign would not fit in the location Dr. Toth had his signage because of the keystone. Dr. Romay noted that the previously existing signage from Dr. Toth was not appropriately installed.

Mr. Hord asked if Dr. Romay obtained a Baltimore County Sign Permit for the work. Dr. Romay stated she did not know approval was necessary because information on signage was not in the Design Guidelines and she was simply swapping one sign for another. Mr. Holman stated that any sign in Baltimore County required a Sign Permit, which was separate from review before the Commission.

Ms. Mundroff stated she wanted the sign to be relocated, but did not want the new location to cover the keystone. Mr. Hord agreed that covering the keystone would also be an inappropriate location. He directed Dr. Romay to revisit the proposal, exploring a different type or size sign, and return to the Commission in March.

Mr. Hord moved to not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or a Notice to Proceed for the sign as installed, to require the property owner to remove the installed sign, and to require the property owner to come back with a new signage proposal. Ms. McIver seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

*Citing National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, Preservation Brief # 25 – The Preservation of Historic Signs; County Code Sec. 32-7-405, 32-7-403*

7. 532 St. Martins LLC Property, 3610 Stoneybrook Road, Fieldstone; Contributing structure in the Fieldstone County Historic District; Replacement of slate roof with architectural asphalt shingles; Replacement of 5" round gutters and downspouts; Replacement of wood windows with vinyl replacements; Removal of four shutters above the side awning; Replacement of wood back door with metal replacement [County Council District # 4]

Ms. Bensley introduced the agenda item, which involved five work items for the exterior of the home at 3610 Stoneybrook Road. She explained that Work item # 1 was for the request to replace the existing, original slate roof with architectural asphalt shingles for the house and side porch awning, and the detached garage. Per the Historic Review Application, the existing roof was old and leaking, and an in-kind replacement would be too costly. Work item # 2 was for the in kind replacement of the existing gutters and downspouts, as the existing were deteriorated and in poor condition. Work item # 3 was for the request to replace the existing wood windows with vinyl replacements. Ms. Bensley explained that the existing windows were 8-over-8, a style very common in the Fieldstone County Historic District. The Historic Review Application cited inoperability, broken glass, lack of screens, and not being energy efficient as reasons for replacement. She continued on that the replacement windows were proposed to be Anderson vinyl windows in white with no grids or grilles. Work item # 4 was the request to remove four, non-original, vinyl shutters (two sets) on the left side of the home, above the side porch awning. Finally, Work item # 5 was the request to remove the back door and install a new one. Ms. Bensley explained that the top half of the door was boarded up, and the bottom half was a 2-panel style. She continued on that based on a 2010 real estate photo staff was able to find, the top half of the door was originally a 6-lite window. The replacement door was proposed to be a 4-panel metal door with a half-moon window at the top.

Mr. Holman welcomed Ms. Cigdem Ata-Mammadov, the property owner.

Ms. Ata-Mammadov explained that she purchased the home in January of 2022 and was flipping it. She stated that it needed a new roof and new windows and that in-kind replacements would be too costly.

Mr. Holman noted explained that the property was in a County Historic District, and therefore there were rules and guidelines to follow.

Mr. Hord stated that the work needed to be in-kind to be appropriate and that it was unfortunate the home was a flip, as the work would be tax credit eligible if the home was homeowner occupied.

Mr. Hord moved to not to Issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or Notice to Proceed for the replacement of the slate roof; issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the gutter and downspout replacement as proposed; not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or a Notice to Proceed for the window replacement as proposed; issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal of the shutters as proposed; and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the back door replacement with the condition the replacement door be a wood or fiberglass material and match the original door in size and appearance. Ms. Evans Letocha seconded the motion.

Ms. Ata-Mammadov noted that other homes in Fieldstone had shingle roofs and vinyl windows. Mr. Holman stated that properties were assessed on a case-by-case basis and that he hoped the elevated materials would increase the value of the home.

The motion passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Roofs: p. 9, Windows and Doors: p. 2-4, 7-8; County Code Sec. 32-7-405*

8. Bair Property, 4607 Prospect Avenue, Glyndon; Non-contributing structure in the Glyndon Historic District; Construction of a 10' x 14' pavilion in the rear yard with a height ranging from 8' 1 ¾" to 10' 1" [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Bensley introduced the agenda item, which involved the request to construct a pavilion/pool shelter in the rear yard of the home at 4607 Prospect Avenue. She explained that this was the fourth review of the proposal. The October and November proposals for the structure were denied due to the following concerns: not having accurate drawings of all sides of the structure; water draining into the neighbor's yard; height; location; visibility from the public right of way; and lack of supports and hurricane ties. The January proposal was denied due to the following concerns: the Commission not knowing the exact location; water drainage issues into the neighboring yard if the structure was located too close to the fence; and being too visible from the public right of way. The homeowner had now submitted additional information on the structure/location proposed at the January meeting. Ms. Bensley explained that the additional information included photos of: the backyard; the location of the shelter; the property line between 4607/4609 Prospect Avenue showing 4609 has a small hill down to 4607 (implying water drainage will not be an issue); a photo showing her fence is 3.5' from the property line; a better site plan with a narrative calling out the exact location of the structure; and a balloon test, conducted by the homeowner, to show the visibility of the pavilion. Finally, Ms. Bensley reminded the Commission that the structure was proposed to be 10' x 14' with a height of 10' 1" in the front and 8' 1 ¾" in the rear. The front was proposed to have an 8' 1" head room clearance and the rear was proposed to have a head clearance of approximately 6' 10 ¾". The structure was proposed to be constructed of pressure treated wood with a gray asphalt shingle roof and be open on all sides. It was proposed to be located on the existing concrete pad.

Mr. Holman welcomed Ms. Donna Bair, the property owner.

Ms. Bair thanked the Commission for their review and stated she had nothing to add.

Ms. Bensley noted that letters in opposition to the project were received from Tom and Kim Montanye, the next door neighbors at 4609 Prospect Avenue; and the Glyndon Community Association.

Mr. Hord thanked Ms. Bair for the additional details and stated that he was okay with the structure as proposed.

Mr. Hord moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the structure as proposed. Ms. McIver seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Additions and Infill: page 4, Fences and Landscape: page 5; County Code Sec. 32-7-405*

9. Francis Property, 510 Sudbrook Lane, Sudbrook Park; Contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District; Replacement of a 12' x 18' portion of the existing ground level deck with a 20' x 30' new "deck" elevated to 8' with parking underneath [County Council District # 2]

Ms. Bensley introduced the agenda item, which involved the removal of an existing, 12' x 18' ground level deck and its replacement with a new, 20' x 30' deck elevated 8' above ground. She explained that the existing deck was located off the rear of the home, which sat on an approximately 1.2 acre lot. The structure was proposed to be constructed of wood, and the raised portion would have plywood and lattice on all three sides. The underneath of the deck was proposed to be used for parking. A mock-up of the proposal and a basic site plan were included in the meeting materials. Ms. Bensley noted that the Sudbrook Park Landmarks Committee reviewed the proposal on January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2022 and they were not in support of the project.

Mr. Holman welcomed Mr. Kevin Francis, the property owner.

Mr. Francis stated that he was looking to do additional covered parking because he liked cars and needed additional space.

Mr. Johnson noted that the structure was, visually, remarkably different from the home.

Mr. Hord noted that a complete site plan was not submitted, so it was difficult to determine if the structure would be visible and/or where it was in relation to the home. He noted that he would like to see a complete site plan and full elevation drawings.

Mr. Weston agreed with Mr. Johnson's comment and stated that Mr. Francis should take cues from the existing porches on the home, not the existing deck, to tie the new garage/deck in with the home.

Mr. Hord moved to not to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or Notice to Proceed for the construction as proposed. Mr. Weston seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being



cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

Ms. Mundroff noted that the homeowner should revisit the proposal with the Sudbrook Park Landmarks Committee.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Fences and Landscape: pages 4-5; County Code Sec. 32-7-405*

- \*\*10.** Monde Property, 1554 South Rolling Road, Relay; Contributing structure in the Relay County Historic District; MIHP # BA-2531; Part II approval for in kind plaster repairs for the first floor fireplace [County Council District #1]

Approved via the Consent Agenda to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

*Citing National Parks Service, Technical Preservation Services, Preservation Brief # 21 - Repairing Historic Flat Plaster; County Code Sec. 11-2-201*

- \*\*11.** Wolf/Adoryan Property, 623 Dunkirk Road, Anneslie; Contributing structure in the Anneslie National Register Historic District; Part II approval for electrical updates [County Council District #5]

Approved via the Consent Agenda to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

*Citing The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring & Reconstructing Historic Buildings; County Code Sec. 11-2-201*

- 12.** Karras Property, 504 Sudbrook Lane, Sudbrook Park; Contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District; Installation of wood and wire deer fence in side and rear yard [County Council District # 2]

Ms. Bensley introduced the agenda item, which involved the request to construct a deer fence to enclose the rear yard and help define a garden. She explained that the fence was proposed to be wire and wood construction. Welded wire in 4" squares would be encased in cedar frame panels, measuring 8'-12' in length and 4' in height. Per the Historic Review Application, the panels would mostly be obscured by plantings once completed. Ms. Bensley continued on that 6" cedar posts would be between each panel, and the posts would then be extended to 7'; stainless steel wire would be strung at 5.5' and 7' to stop deer from getting in the garden/yard. She noted that, in addition to the fence, two wooden flat topped arbors with gates – one on the left side of the home, and on the right – were also proposed.

Mr. Holman welcomed Ms. Deana Karras, the property owner.

Ms. Karras stated that she had lived in Sudbrook Park for over 25 years, that she was an avid gardener, and that she was trying to find an appropriate compromise that was both practical and fitting with the Design Guidelines.

Ms. McIver questioned if it was possible to do a fence over the garden, rather than enclosing the backyard. Ms. Karras stated she was looking to garden the whole yard, so that would not work.

Mr. Weston stated he was okay with the proposal as long as it met Zoning Regulations.

Mr. Hord stated that he liked the design and proposed materials of the fence. He noted that with adequate landscaping, the fence would be screened from the street.

Mr. Hord moved to issue a Notice to Proceed for the deer fence as proposed. Mr. Weston seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Fences and Landscape: pages 1-5; County Code Sec. 32-7-405*

- \*\*13.** Kecken Property, 3605 Fieldstone Road, Fieldstone; Contributing structure in the Fieldstone County Historic District; In kind replacement of asphalt shingle roof and aluminum gutters [County Council District # 4]

Approved via the Consent Agenda to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Roofs: page 10; County Code Sec. 32-7-405*

- \*\*14.** Christopolis Property, 1549 South Rolling Road, Relay; Non-contributing structure in the Relay County Historic District; Installation of a 6' board on board wood fence and two Wyngate style gates to finish enclosing the rear yard [County Council District # 1]

Approved via the Consent Agenda to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Fences and Landscape: page 4; County Code Sec. 32-7-405*

- 15.** Marx/Kendzierski Property, 507 Sudbrook Lane, Sudbrook Park; Contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District; MIHP # BA-3026; Installation of a spaced board or 3-board paddock wood fence to enclose a portion of the backyard [County Council District #2]

Ms. Bensley introduced the agenda item, which involved approval for a new wooden fence to enclose a portion of the backyard of the home at 507 Sudbrook Lane to secure dogs and children. She explained that the homeowner had provided two styles for review: a spaced board fence with cap boards or a three-board paddock fence with wire backing. Either fence would be all wood and 48" tall with three gates – two single and one double. On the spaced board fence, the gap between each of the spaced boards would be 2.5" and the boards would only on one side of the fence. Ms. Bensley noted that, in a January 31<sup>st</sup> email to staff, the homeowners stated that the spaced board fence was preferred.

Mr. Weston moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the spaced board fence as proposed. Mr. Hord seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Fences and Landscape: page 4; County Code Sec. 32-7-405*

### **Other Business**

Ms. Bensley informed the Commission that emergency in kind repairs were approved for the following property following a fire:

Moore/Jain Property, 128 North Beechwood Avenue, Catonsville; MHT approval for in kind replacement of deteriorated slate roof tiles and replacement of roofing components (gutters, downspouts, valleys, hips, ridges, etc.) [County Council District # 1]

Ms. Bensley informed the Commission that the Technical Committee's report on the site visit to 361 Briarstone Road was included in the meeting materials; the Committee offered conditional approval of the replacement of the windows. Mr. Holman thanked Ms. McIver and Ms. Mundroff for attending the site visit.

Mr. Hord moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Weston seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

The meeting adjourned at 8:11 PM.

TAB:tab