

Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission
March 10th, 2022 Meeting Minutes

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

Mr. Hord, Vice-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 | Ms. Selisa Jefferson |
| Mr. John Holman, Chair | |
| Mr. Scott Holupka | |
| Mr. Ed Hord , Vice-Chair | |
| Mr. Vincent Johnson | |
| Ms. Wendy Mclver | |
| Ms. Lili Mundroff | |
| Mr. Stephen Myer | |
| Ms. Marina Novaes | |
| Mr. Raymond Scott | |
| Mr. Christopher Weston | |

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

Ms. Mclver joined the meeting at 6:08 PM.

1. Review of the Agenda

Ms. Bensley reported no changes to the Preliminary Agenda published March 3rd, 2022.

2. Approval of the Minutes

Mr. Hord asked if anyone proposed changes to the February 10th, 2022 Minutes. Ms. Evans Letocha noted one correction, as the last paragraph of page six used different tenses. Ms. Bensley stated she would correct the Minutes before publishing. Mr. Myer moved to approve the Minutes as corrected. Mr. Weston seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Mclver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Myer, Ms. Novaes, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

Mr. Holman entered the meeting at 6:12 PM. Mr. Hord relinquished the role of Chair over Mr. Holman.

3. Consent Agenda

Ms. Bensley read the Action Recommendations for Consent Agenda Items 4, 5, and 9.

Mr. Holman asked if anyone wished to discuss the Consent Agenda Items further. Ms. Mundroff stated she had comments on Item 5, the Bair property. Ms. Mundroff moved to remove Item 5 from the Consent Agenda and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the remaining Consent Agenda Items as proposed. Mr. Myer seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Myer, Ms. Novaes, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

Items for Discussion and Vote

- **4.** Monkton Hotel (Otters Hollow Properties LLC Property), 1900 Monkton Road, Monkton; Contributing structure in the Monkton County Historic District; Final Landmark # 35; MIHP # BA-116; Replacement and slight relocation of deteriorated, 6', wooden privacy fence [County Council District # 3]

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

- 5.** Bair Property, 4607 Prospect Avenue, Glyndon; Non-contributing structure in the Glyndon Historic District; Addition of one (1) window on the right elevation to serve as additional egress to meet Code [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Bensley introduced the agenda item, which involved the installation of a new window on the right elevation. She explained that, in fall 2018, staff was alerted that the property owner at 4607 Prospect Avenue had done significant work without LPC approval and/or proper Building Permits; over the past 3.5 years, most of the Code Violations and LPC issues had been addressed and the final issue to be resolved was the construction of an addition on the west side of the home to fill in a previously existing recessed bay. Ms. Bensley continued that the addition to fill in the recess was approved by the Commission on March 14th, 2019 following a March 11th, 2019 site visit by a Technical Committee. On February 10th, 2022, Baltimore County Building Inspections visited the property for the final inspection and to officially close out the Code Violation and found that the addition, as constructed, did not meet Code as it did not have appropriate egress. To rectify the issue, the homeowner needed to install a new window on the right elevation. The window was proposed to be a six-over-six, 35.5" x 59.5" double hung vinyl window to match the windows on the rest of the home. It was proposed to be located 3' in front the front façade and the bottom of the window was proposed to align with the bottom of the windows on the front façade.

Ms. Mundroff noted that the new window was taller than the windows on the front elevation, and questioned if the head or sill heights of the new window should align with the windows on the front elevation, if a 12-lite casement window would be more appropriate, and if the new window would meet Code. Ms. Bensley confirmed the window would meet Code. Mr. Weston stated that, if the new window was taller than the windows on the front façade, the head heights should align, not the sill heights. He continued that he was in support of the six-over-six window versus a 12-lite casement window as it would match the other windows on the home.

Ms. Mundroff moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the window installation with the condition the head height of the window aligned with the windows on the front elevation, also in that bedroom. Mr. Weston seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms.

Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Myer, Ms. Novaes, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Windows and Doors, page 5; County Code Sec. 32-7-405, 32-7-403

6. DeLuca Property, 212 West Seminary Avenue, Lutherville; Contributing structure in the Lutherville County Historic District; MIHP # BA-323; Construction of one-story, sunroom addition off the rear of the home [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Bensley introduced the agenda item, which involved the construction of a one-story addition off the rear of the home. She explained that the proposal came before the Commission in September 2021, where staff, the Commission, and the Lutherville Advisory Committee offered significant feedback on the plans. Feedback included: using one-over-one wood windows; using a different style of cladding; in-setting the addition approximately 4" so it did not align with the right façade; redoing the drawings, as they did not make sense; exploring the option of doing a crawlspace; and reviewing the recommendations of the Lutherville Advisory Committee. Since the September meeting, the homeowner had reworked the proposal and all prior suggestions had been taken into account. The addition was proposed to be 20' long, one-story, off the rear of the home and inset 6" from the right façade. The upper half of the addition was proposed to be vertical Hardie Plank board and batten style siding, and the lower half was proposed to be cedar shake shingles to match the home. Below the cedar shingles, wooden lattice to grade was proposed. The windows were proposed to be one-over-one wood windows, and the rear door was proposed to be a wooden full-lite exterior door. The roof was proposed to be a metal roof in polar gray to match the existing 2nd story bay window roofs, and the gutters were proposed to be metal. Off the exterior door, a rear landing and steps to grade were proposed. The landing/steps were proposed to be pressure treated wood with balusters to be re-created to closely mimic existing rear porch railings.

Mr. Holman welcomed the property owner, Mr. Michael DeLuca.

The Commission had no comments or questions about the proposal.

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

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Additions and Infill, pages 2-4; County Code Sec. 32-7-405

7. Waltemyer Property, 206 West Seminary Avenue, Lutherville; Contributing structure in the Lutherville County Historic District; MIHP # BA-343; Rebuild of demolished garage following February 10th, 2022 LPC Decision for Code Enforcement Correction Notice # CB2100502 [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Bensley introduced the agenda item, which involved plans to reconstruct a garage demolished in August 2021 without LPC review and/or a Razing Permit. She reminded the Commission that the property owner's team came before the Commission in February 2022 seeking ex-post facto approval of the demolition, but the Commission voted not to approve the demolition as completed and required the property owners to submit plans for rebuilding the structure by April 11th, 2022. Ms. Bensley explained that the garage was now proposed to be rebuilt. The garage structure was proposed to be 12' 2" x 17' 1"

with an 18' 2" x 9' 9" lean to addition on the rear. The garage was proposed to be 5.5" x 5.5" exposed face cedar shake shingles painted to match the home. It was proposed to have an 8' wide, painted white, bead board center panel over plywood swing doors on the south elevation, facing West Seminary Avenue. The garage was proposed to have an asphalt shingle roof, which matched the roof when the garage was demolished in 2021. The east and west elevations were each proposed to have one cedar board window casing with a glass window. The rear addition was also proposed to be 5.5" x 5.5" exposed face cedar shake shingles painted to match the home with an asphalt shingle roof. The west elevation was proposed to have painted white, 8' 6", 2x4 wood panel sliding door. The east and north elevations were each proposed to have one window with window trim and glass. Per the Historic Review Application, the structure was proposed to be located in the previously existing spot and will use the remaining foundation and slab.

Ms. Bensley noted that letters about the proposal were received by the Lutherville Advisory Committee, the local historic group; Mr. Charlie Davis, the owner of the property behind 206 West Seminary Avenue; and Ms. Marianne Wittelsberger, the former owner.

Mr. Holman welcomed the applicant and his team: Mr. Tim Sanders of Sanders Designs; Mr. Brandon Weirich of Sanders Designs; Ms. Savannah Blakely of Sanders Designs; Ms. Glenda Sanders of Sanders Designs; Mr. Scott Breza of Hofmeister and Breza; Dr. Bonnie Potter, Executor of the estate; and Mr. William Castle, former Executor of the estate.

Mr. Sanders thanked the Commission for their time reviewing the rebuild proposal. He noted that the home and garage were a Foursquare American shingled style, which, for the home, meant four equal rooms in the four corners. He continued on that this was derived from the Prairie style of architecture, which emphasized horizontality and simplicity. With this, he asked the Commission to revisit a conversation brought up at the February 2022 meeting on not rebuilding the rear lean-to addition of the garage. He stated that the addition violated all practical disciplines of the County Code and was not consistent architecturally. Mr. Sanders concluded his comments by providing an updated on where the owner's team was with the proposal and sale of the home, stating that a survey was going to be completed on March 17th, an engineer was already involved, and the project was currently out to four contractors to price out.

Mr. Weston agreed the lean-to addition was not architecturally significant and stated that it looked like something a previous homeowner had constructed. Mr. Sanders thanked Mr. Weston for his comment and reiterated that the addition violated the principles of Foursquare American architecture, which emphasized simplicity and horizontality. He remarked that the elevation drawings were completed within 72 hours of him being brought onto the project; in the two weeks since they had been submitted, Mr. Sanders had thought the proposal over in more depth and stated he believed the structure would be more historically appropriate if the addition was omitted. If omitted, the rear elevation would simply have one window, consistent with the others. He noted that this request was not for financial reasons.

Mr. Weston confirmed that, if omitted, the structure would be rectangular with a gable roof. Mr. Sanders confirmed that was correct and that the left, right, and rear elevations would each have one window. Mr. Weston stated that, architecturally, that was a superior outcome.

Mr. Hord stated that the neighbors and the Lutherville Advisory Committee had been very involved in the review of this project and that it had been rather contentious at the beginning. He questioned if the Commission had concerns approving the omission of the lean-to addition without prior notice to the

neighborhood. Ms. Evans Letocha and Ms. McIver stated they had reservations and would like to hear from the neighbors before approval.

Ms. Evans Letocha noted that the addition documented vernacular architecture and provided history on the property.

Mr. Holman acknowledged that review from the neighbors and the Lutherville Advisory Committee would mean that the structure was not approved until the April meeting at the earliest. Ms. Sanders requested the garage be approved with the lean-to addition as currently proposed, for timing purposes. Ms. Bensley explained that the proposal could be approved or conditionally approved as submitted and then, if the owner's team decided to omit the rear lean-to addition, the proposal could be reviewed by the neighbors and the Lutherville Advisory Committee and then resubmitted to the Landmarks Preservation Commission for a later meeting.

Mr. Sanders asked if the Commission reviewed the rear lean-to addition. Mr. Hord stated they did not, but that it was possible it was constructed prior to the historic designation.

Mr. Weston moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the garage and lean to addition reconstruction as proposed. Ms. McIver seconded the motion.

Ms. Evans Letocha asked about the windows, as the drawings did not show any panes. Mr. Sanders recognized that the drawings of the windows did not match what was originally existing, as he received a photo of the windows after the drawings were submitted. He stated that the windows would be three-over-three style as previously existed. Mr. Weston accepted the updated window configuration as an amendment to his motion.

Ms. Mundroff questioned the materials of the exposed rafters and if they would be cedar. Mr. Weirich stated that the structure was proposed to be rebuilt to match what was demolished. He stated that the drawings could be updated so that the rafters were cedar if that was the Commission's preference. Mr. Sanders questioned if only the outriggers, the visible component of the rafters, could be cedar. Mr. Myer suggested the outriggers be cedar and the interior be pressure-treated southern yellow pine. Mr. Sanders and Mr. Weirich were in support of Mr. Myer's suggestion.

Mr. Weston withdrew his original motion so there was no confusion on what the motion was.

Mr. Weston entered a new motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the reconstruction of the garage and lean-to addition with the conditions the windows be the three-over-three style originally on the garage to replicate the original windows; and the outriggers be made of cedar. Ms. McIver seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Myer, Ms. Novaes, 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

- 8.** Valley Inn (Brooklandville House) (Valley Inn Properties LLC Property), 10501 Falls Road, Timonium; Final Landmark # 198; MIHP # BA-218; Contributing structure in the Greenspring Valley National Register Historic District; Replacement of leaking existing three-tab asphalt shingle roof on the historic sloped sections of the structure with CertainTeed Landmark Pro fiberglass shingles; Construction of a 9' x 33'

gable roof structure on the non-historic flat roof; Replacement of three-tab asphalt shingle roof on the entry gable with a standing seam metal roof [County Council District # 2]

Ms. Bensley introduced the agenda item, which involved three work items for the exterior of Valley Inn, a circa 1832 two-story stone building that had, historically, been used as a tavern, post office, stagecoach stop, tea room, sales display room, sports center and, most recently, as a restaurant. She explained that Work Item 1 involved the request to replace the existing three-tab asphalt shingle roof on the historic sloped sections of the structure with CertainTeed Landmark Pro fiberglass shingles in the color Colonial Slate, as the existing roof was leaking in multiple spots. Work Item 2 involved the request to construct a 19' x 33' gable roof structure on the non-historic flat roof over the existing bar. The structure was proposed to have a standing seam metal roof and white aluminum spouting. The T-111 vertical cladding siding on this section of the building was proposed to be removed and the gable and this section of the building were proposed to be clad with stained cedar shingles. All existing windows were proposed to be maintained and kept in their place. The purpose with this work was to create a vaulted ceiling over the bar inside and to break up the modern, long box structure that faced the north parking lot and Falls Road. Work Item 3 involved the request to replace the three-tab asphalt shingle roof on the entry gable with a standing seam metal roof in order to tie the entrance in with the new gable roof structure.

Mr. Holman welcomed Mr. Vincent Greene of Vincent Greene Architects.

Mr. Greene noted that the new gable roof structure would screen mechanical equipment on the roof.

Mr. Holupka entered the meeting at 6:57 PM.

The Commission had no comments or questions about the proposal.

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

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Roofs, pages 6-10; Additions and Infill, pages 1-4; County Code Sec. 32-7-405

- **9.** Sobel Property, 4704 Butler Road, Glyndon; Non-contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District; Installation of wooden fencing along rear property line and to the left of an existing, detached garage; In-kind replacement of two picket gates [County Council District # 3]

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

- 10.** Battle Acre (Baltimore County Department of Parks & Recreation Property) 3115 North Point Road, Dundalk; Final Landmark # 19; MIHP # BA-636; Installation of memorial monuments and associated hardscaping; Replacement of missing fence/gate section; Replacement of existing light poles [County Council District # 7]

Ms. Bensley introduced the agenda item, which involved three work items for Battle Acre, a memorial park in Dundalk. She explained that the work was proposed in conjunction with Phase II of the Battle Acre Rehabilitation and Improvement, a project funded by the Maryland Bond Bill. Work Item 1 was for the installation of hardscaping for two new memorial stones, which were proposed to be engraved with the names of the American soldiers who fell in the Battle of North Point. Work Item 2 was for the installation of a gate to fill in a gap in the fence line. The gate was proposed to be steel and match the design of the front entrance, while remaining a necessary point of vehicle ingress and egress. Work Item 3 was for new lighting/light poles. The new lighting would complement the site and would be an improvement to what was existing. Ms. Bensley noted that, because the work was being completed with State funds, Maryland Historical Trust had reviewed the work and found it had no adverse effect on historic resources.

Mr. Holman welcomed Mr. Jay Doyle and Mr. David ODell, both of Baltimore County Department of Recreation and Parks.

The Commission had no comments or questions about the proposal.

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

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Fences and Landscape, pages 3-4; 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:

Wales Property, 31 Dunkirk Road, Rodgers Forge; ER approval for the replacement of the boiler
[County Council District # 5]

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

The meeting adjourned at 7:02 PM.

TAB:tab