

**Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission**  
**April 14<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 6:03 p.m. Through the meeting, the following Commission members were:

Present	Not Present
Mr. John Holman, Chair	Ms. Phoebe Evans Letocha
Mr. Scott Holupka	Mr. Stephen Myer
Mr. Ed Hord , Vice-Chair	Ms. Marina Novaes
Ms. Selisa Jefferson	
Mr. Vincent Johnson	
Ms. Wendy Mclver	
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. Jessica Brannock (Preservation Planner).

Mr. Holman welcomed Ms. Brannock and thanked Ms. Bensley for her dedication and service to the Commission.

**1. Review of the Agenda**

Ms. Merritt reported no changes to the Preliminary Agenda published April 7<sup>th</sup>, 2022.

**2. Approval of the Minutes**

Mr. Holman asked if anyone proposed changes to the March 10<sup>th</sup>, 2022 Minutes. Mr. Weston moved to approve the Minutes as proposed. Ms. Mclver seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. Jefferson, Ms. Mclver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

**3. Consent Agenda**

Ms. Brannock read the Action Recommendations for Consent Agenda Items 4, 6, 8 and 11.

Mr. Holman asked if anyone wished to discuss the Consent Agenda Items further. The Commission had no comments or questions. Mr. Hord moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Consent Agenda Items as proposed. Ms. Mclver seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. Jefferson, Ms. Mclver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

## Items for Discussion and Vote

- \*\*4.** Taylor Property, 703 Woodland Drive, Relay; Vacant lot in the Relay County Historic District; Amendment to infill construction plans approved November 2021 (Changes to dwelling location, dwelling orientation, and driveway configuration) [County Council District # 1]

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

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Fences and Landscape: pages 1-3; Additions and Infill: pages 4-5; County Code Sec. 32-7-405*

- 5.** “Pot Spring Farm House Slave Quarters” and Setting (Byrd Property), 2201 Pot Spring Road, Timonium; Final Landmark # 267; MIHP # BA-434; Amended plans to garage addition approved November 2020 [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved several amendments to plans for a garage addition that was last approved by the LPC November 2020. The garage addition was originally conditionally approved in June 2016 but then never constructed. In September 2020, the homeowners sought approval to downsize the garage, but the Commission had concerns on the location, roofs, and porch/garage overlap and denied the application. Ms. Brannock noted that the homeowners received approval for the garage addition construction in November 2020 and were now ready to apply for a permit, but had made minor adjustments to the plans. The first change was a change in the pitch of the garage addition roof in order to accommodate a storage area above the garage. The garage addition was originally approved to be an 8/12 pitch and had been amended to be a 10.5/12 pitch. The new slope made the garage taller than the mudroom connecting the garage to the home. The second change was on the rear elevation of the garage addition from a vent to a six-over-six window. The window proposed matched some of the other windows on the home and was not proposed to have shutters. Ms. Brannock commented that the change in the roof height made the garage height taller than the mudroom hyphen, the two-story front porch, and the historic addition on the west side of the house. The Baltimore County Design Guidelines stated that additions should be visually subordinate to the historic structure and that the height should be lower than the historic parts of a structure. Since the garage extended in front of the primary facade and couldn't be set back from the main façade due to site constraints, special consideration needed to be kept in the design to ensure that the new construction didn't overpower the historic structure. Staff asked that the Commission discuss the pitch change and its potential visual effects on the entire structure. Additionally, Ms. Brannock noted that the proposed window looks very large for the space.

Mr. Hord stated that the proposed garage addition still appeared subordinate to the main house. Mr. Weston agreed, but voiced concern that the garage was set slightly in front of the main house; he noted, however, that the location had already been approved by the Commission.

Ms. Mundroff raised concern for the proposed garage window and asked if an awning window that matched the hyphen could be used. Additionally, Ms. Mundroff asked if the large window was proposed to meet egress concerns.

Mr. Weston, Mr. Holupka, and Ms. Mundroff voiced concern over the shutters shown on the proposed design drawings. Ms. Mundroff noted that the shutters shown on the first and second stories did not match the historic home, and that the style was difficult to distinguish on the images provided.

Mr. Hord asked if the homeowners were in attendance. Ms. Bensley replied that they were not present.

Mr. Holman proposed that the Commission could either: deny the proposal and ask the homeowners to provide more details on the shutters and propose a smaller window; or approve the proposal with the condition the attic gable window on the front be smaller to match the 2<sup>nd</sup> story window on the west addition and have no shutters, and the condition additional details be provided to staff prior to permit approval. Commissioners voiced their agreement with Mr. Holman's second option.

Ms. Mundroff moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the amended drawings with the revised roof ridge elevation and pitch, and request that the second floor garage window, all garage shutters and hyphen shutters return to staff for review and approval. Mr. Hord seconded the motion.

Mr. Holman detailed that the work would return to staff who could then contact Ms. Mundroff and Mr. Weston for their comments. Ms. Merritt stated that staff could not redistribute updated materials to the Commission or ask for a vote by phone or email after the LPC had voted, as this would be in violation of the Open Meetings Act. She noted that the plans could be approved with the conditions that the homeowners provide more information on the shutters, that the shutters match the shutters on the historic house, and that a smaller window be used on the west elevation. Mr. Holman clarified that he was not suggesting staff contact each Commissioner, but suggested reaching out to individuals who may provide applicable technical advice.

Ms. Mundroff accepted the amended motion and moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that the roof height match the height of the mudroom, and a smaller window be used, that matches the 6-light window on the west block of the historic house, and to clarify the style of shutters. Mr. Weston seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. Jefferson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Additions and Infill: p. 1-7; County Code Sec. 32-7-405*

- \*\*6.** Plano Property, 320 Morris Avenue, Lutherville; Non-contributing structure in the Lutherville County Historic District; Installation of new fencing in the rear and side yard to match the existing [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*

- 7.** Karras Property, 504 Sudbrook Lane, Sudbrook Park; Contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District; Removal of front walkway and replace with loose stone path; Installation of raised beds walkway (Code Enforcement Correction Notice CB2200156) [County Council District # 2]

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved plans for two hardscaping/landscaping projects in the front and side yard to resolve Correction Notice CB2200156. Ms. Brannock noted that the

property owner came before the commission in February 2022 and was issued a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of a wood and wire deer fence on the side and rear yard. She continued on that some of the components of the project fell within the Commission's purview, specifically the hardscaping, but that landscaping, plantings, and mulching did not.

Ms. Brannock explained that the first work item involved the ex-post facto removal of the front concrete walkway that led from the street to the front steps; the walkway on the front right-side; and the rear walkway that led from the house to the detached garage. The owner was in the process of installing a new pathway system using loose barn-stone. The pathways were proposed to be 3 feet wide, with ¾" barn-stone spread to a depth of 4," topped with 1" of 3/8" barn-stone. The design/layout of the new pathways, consisted of a circular design in the front with plantings in the middle, and pathways on the left and right sides that curved towards the side and rear yard. The second work item involved the installation of simple raised beds within the existing deer fence area on the side yard, between the house and detached garage. The layout was proposed to be approximately 30' x 40', with beds laid out in a 2 by 5 configuration that consisted of six regularly spaced, 4' x 8' beds with, two, 2.5' x 19' beds in between each pair of 4' by 8' beds. The beds were proposed to be a brick border stacked two to four bricks high atop compact soil. The beds were proposed to be surrounded by the same 3' wide barn-stone pathways to match the front yard hardscaping.

Mr. Weston noted that the Sudbrook Park Landmarks Committee approved the proposed work.

Ms. McIver stated that the circular paths appeared overly formal for the house, but that the gravel was an appropriate choice.

The Commission had no further comments or questions about the proposal.

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

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Fences and Landscape: page 3. County Code Sec. 32-7-405*

- \*\*8.** Altbach/Hohman Property, 1018 Windsor Road, Sudbrook; Contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District; In-kind chimney repairs/replacements [County Council District # 2]

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

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Roofs: p. 4. County Code Sec. 32-7-405.*

- 9.** Ortuglio Property, 219 W Seminary Avenue, Lutherville; Non-contributing, infill structure in the Lutherville County Historic District; Enclose existing garage; Construct a one-story 25' x 42' detached garage; and Connect spaces with a new covered walkway and vestibule [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved three work items for exterior alterations to the east side of the home. Work consisted of converting the existing garage into a living space, constructing a detached garage, and constructing a covered walkway and vestibule. She noted that the home was an in-fill construction built in 2011/2012 following approval from the Commission in March

2011. Ms. Brannock explained that Work Item 1 proposed to enclose an existing 2-car garage space on the east elevation of the house to convert it into a living space. Work Item 2 involved the request to construct a one-story 25' x 42', detached garage that was proposed to face West Seminary Avenue. The garage was proposed to have a black tin standing seam roof with concealed fasteners, two 8' x 7' metal garage doors (with the appearance of wood) on the front and a set of white 25" x 45" six-over-one double-hung simulated divided light wrapped wood windows (Anderson 200 Series) centered over the front doors opening from the garage attic. The west façade was proposed to have two metal paneled doors on either end with two additional white 25" x 45" windows evenly spaced in the center to match. Beige HardiPlank siding was proposed to be used to match the front house façade. Ms. Brannock added that the proposed location of the garage was along the property line, which bordered a shared driveway. Additionally, the location was outside of the 20' setback required by the Zoning Regulations. Work Item 3 involved the construction of a covered walkway and vestibule located on the southeast corner of the main house to connect the main house to the new garage. The entry vestibule was proposed to be a 7'-1" x 7'-1" addition on the southeast corner. It was proposed to have a sloped black asphalt shingle roof covering a walkway extending 11'-5" south to the new garage, and measure 8'-6 ¼" high.

Ms. Brannock stated that letters in opposition to the proposal were received by the Lutherville Advisory Committee, the local historic group; Ms. Stacie Forrester and Mr. Shane Harris, the owners of 215 West Seminary Avenue; and Mr. and Mrs. Jim and Sara Brown, the owners of 211-B West Seminary Avenue.

Mr. Holman welcomed the property owner, Mr. Kevin Ortuglio. Mr. Ortuglio thanked the Commission and stated that he was available for questions.

Ms. Bensley introduced Ms. Marie Frederick, head of the Lutherville Advisory Committee. Ms. Frederick explained that the proposed garage was not in keeping with the neighborhood, as most homes had original carriage houses that were used as garages or for storage rather than homes having front-facing detached garages. Ms. Frederick stated concerns with the size of the garage, noting that no garages in the district were as large and that the garage size could obstruct the surrounding neighbor's view of the property from the east and west sides. She concluded her comments by pointing out that the garage did not have any windows on the east side of the structure.

Ms. Merritt noted that the visual aspects of the proposed detached garage, as seen from the road, were consistent with other detached garages found in Lutherville, and cited 1421 Francke Avenue, 209 W Seminary Avenue, 202 W Seminary Avenue, 1509 Bellona Avenue, and 309 Morris Avenue as examples.

Ms. Bensley introduced Ms. Stacie Forrester and Mr. Shane Harris, rear neighbors at 215 W Seminary Avenue that shared the connected driveway with 219 W Seminary Avenue. Mr. Harris raised concerns with the large size of the detached garage and obstruction of the view from his home. He stated that the shared driveway was heavily trafficked by neighbors and children, and that a large structure obscuring visibility presented a safety concern to vehicles and pedestrians. He noted that emergency vehicles could have difficulty accessing homes at the end of the shared driveway.

Mr. Holman thanked the speakers for their testimonies.

Mr. Vincent Johnson entered the meeting at 6:41 PM.

Mr. Weston and Mr. Holman stated that many of the concerns were issues for the Office of Zoning, and that they did not think the work would be approved.

Ms. Merritt noted that the garage construction would need a Zoning Variance; the process was public and would allow citizens to voice concerns on Zoning-related issues.

Mr. Holman asked for clarification on if the homeowners would need to return to the LPC once they received feedback from the Office of Zoning if the Commission approved the work. Ms. Merritt explained that, if there were changes to the proposed location or design, the work would need to come back before the Commission; if the work was approved by Zoning as proposed, it would not return to the Commission prior to permitting.

Ms. Mundroff noted that the Lutherville Advisory Committee was not contacted, nor had they approved the proposed project. She suggested that the homeowners receive approval from the Lutherville Advisory Committee before approaching the Office of Zoning or returning to the LPC.

Mr. Holman agreed that this was a neighborhood issue, and asked the Commission to center discussion on the proposed addition and design within the purview of the Baltimore County Historic Guidelines—assuming that Zoning was not an issue. He reiterated that if the proposal was approved, the LPC would not be able to review the project again after it went through the Office of Zoning; if the proposal was denied, the LPC would have a second opportunity for review.

Mr. Hord raised concern with the location of the proposed garage and stated that it was situated directly on the property line and along a very narrow driveway. He acknowledged a comment made by Ms. Frederick, representing the Lutherville Advisory Committee, regarding the lack of windows on the west side of the proposed garage, and stated that he did not believe side windows were permitted on structures located on the property line. Mr. Hord and Ms. Merritt noted again that this is an issue for the Office of Zoning.

Ms. Mundroff voiced concern that the proposed garage did not preserve the view shed of the neighborhood, and if the in-fill construction was designed to preserve the view sheds, this proposed garage did not. Mr. Hord responded that he did not believe the addition would obstruct the historic character of the neighborhood or view shed of West Seminary Avenue.

Mr. Weston reverberated Mr. Hord that the Office of Zoning would address Zoning concerns and that the issues raised were not under the purview of the LPC.

Ms. Mundroff added that the Office of Zoning will determine if the size of the proposed garage was appropriate.

Mr. Hord moved to not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or a Notice to Proceed for the work items as proposed, and recommended the homeowners contact both the Lutherville Advisory Committee and the Office of Zoning before returning before the Commission. Mr. Weston seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by 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, Windows and Doors: p. 5, 8., Roofs: p. 6, 10., Façade Materials: p. 2, 3, 6., Additions and Infill: p. 2, 3, 5., Fences and Landscape: p. 4, 5. County Code Sec. 32-7-405*

**10. “Cub Hill House” (Kulyk Property), 9301 Old Harford Road; Final Landmark # 67, MIHP # BA-281; Expansion of existing side addition [County Council District # 3]**

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved plans to expand a portion of an existing 1-story, board and batten, 1970’s kitchen addition. The proposed expansion addition was to be located on the east elevation of the home. The proposal included extending the footprint of the existing addition, and adding a 2<sup>nd</sup> story. The addition was proposed to consist of a mudroom and staircase on the first floor and storage on the second. It was proposed to be clad with, ¾” PT plywood, with 1x3 strips to create a board and batten pattern to match the existing. The roof line was proposed to align with that of the historic stone portion of the house and was proposed to be a standing seam metal roof to match the existing. The homeowner wished to add a schoolhouse bell that was salvaged from an antique shop to the top of the addition. Ms. Brannock added that the Baltimore County Design Guidelines stated that an “appropriately designed addition should be visually subordinate to the primary building” and that the height should be lower than the historic structure. She continued on that staff had several recommendations for the project including that the roofline be dropped, the overhang be removed, and that it match the setback of the additions building line. Ms. Brannock continued that the south elevation (rear) was proposed to be set back from the adjacent building line, and that the existing rear exterior door would be reused on this elevation. Four, black, 6–over-6 divided light, aluminum clad, Pella windows were proposed on the first and second story of the rear elevation, and would match the other windows on this addition, however window dimensions were not provided.

Ms. Bensley introduced Mr. Jury Kulyk, the property owner. Mr. Kulyk stated that he would make any adjustments required by the Commission, and explained that he had experienced considerable delays beginning the project, having gone through four different architects. He noted that he hoped to break ground on the project soon and requested approval to pour the foundation.

Mr. Holman stated that the Commission would either approve or deny the current proposal and urged Mr. Kulyk not to begin work before receiving permission and the necessary permits.

Ms. Bensley added that the Mr. Jason Charalambides, the architect is online.

Mr. Hord asked if a site plan was provided, noting that the drawings included were not adequate site or floor plans.

Mr. Holupka noted difficulties viewing the property from the images provided, but that he was able to locate the house on Google Street View, though it was not fully visible. He noticed that the home was off-set at roughly a 45 degree angle from the Old Harford Road, and that the addition was set back on the corner of the house. Mr. Hord agreed that it was difficult to see the location of the addition. Both Commissioners agreed a better site plan and exterior photos would be beneficial.

Ms. Mundroff requested that additional photos and adequate floor plans be provided in a resubmittal.

Mr. Charalambides, architect of the project, noted that the full design plans were provided, but were not shown in the PowerPoint. Ms. Merritt replied that all materials were shared with the Commission. She stated that the presented PowerPoint served as a summary of the proposed work and as a visual aide for the meeting but did not include all submitted materials.

Mr. Holman agreed that the Commission needed better images of the property and design to adequately review the proposal.

Ms. McIver reentered the meeting at 7:04 PM following minor technical difficulties.

Mr. Hord moved to not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or a Notice to Proceed for the work as proposed and recommended the owner return with better plans that were more compatible with the Guidelines, clear photos of each elevation of the home, and a detailed site plan. Ms. Mundroff seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Mundroff, and Mr. Scott. Mr. Weston recused himself from the vote, explaining that the homeowner had solicited him for the proposed work. Ms. McIver abstained from voting, stating that she had technical difficulties hearing testimony from the homeowner and his architect.

Mr. Holman thanked Mr. Kulyk and Mr. Charalambides, and added that staff would be in touch with how to proceed.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Additions & Infill: page 3. County Code Sec. 32-7-405*

- \*\*11.** Savage Property, 911 Adana Road, Sudbrook Park Monkton; Contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District; Wood fence installation [County Council District # 2]

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

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

### **Other Business**

Ms. Merritt informed the Commission that the following historic property tax credit applications were approved by staff as an emergency repair or due to the receipt of Part II approval for work reviewed by Maryland Historic Trust:

Oakwood Bungalow (Kriemelmeyer Property), 1301 Edmondson Avenue, Catonsville; MHT approval for in kind rebuild of original chimney [County Council District # 1]

Martin Property, 2103 Westchester Avenue, Catonsville; MHT approval for water pipe replacements, electrical wiring upgrades, and plaster repairs [County Council District # 1]

Ms. Bensley thanked the Commissioners and expressed her gratitude for serving as Secretary to the Commission.

Mr. Hord moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. McIver seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by 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 7:09 PM.

JCB:jcb