

**Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission
May 12th, 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:

<u>Present</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
Ms. Phoebe Evans Letocha	Ms. Selisa Jefferson
Mr. John Holman, Chair	Mr. Stephen Myer
Mr. Scott Holupka	Mr. Raymond Scott
Mr. Ed Hord , Vice-Chair	
Mr. Vincent Johnson	
Ms. Wendy McIver	
Ms. Lili Mundroff	
Ms. Marina Novaes	
Mr. Christopher Weston	

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

Mr. Hord, Vice Chair, presided over the meeting for Mr. Holman, Chair.

1. Review of the Agenda

Ms. Brannock reported no changes to the Preliminary Agenda published May 5th, 2022.

2. Approval of the Minutes

Mr. Hord asked if anyone proposed changes to the April 14th, 2022 Minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Hord moved to approve the Minutes as proposed. The motion passed with affirmative voice votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Ms. Novaes, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Hord. There were no dissenting votes.

3. Consent Agenda

Ms. Brannock read the Action Recommendations for Consent Agenda Items 4, 6, 8, 10, 11, 14, and 15.

Mr. Hord asked if anyone wished to discuss the Consent Agenda Items further. Ms. Mundroff stated she had comments on Item 4, the Lang property. Mr. Holman moved to remove Item 4 from the Consent Agenda and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the remaining Consent Agenda Items as proposed. Mr. Weston seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms.

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

Items for Discussion and Vote

4. Valley Brook (Lang Property), 16620 Wesley Chapel Road, Monkton; contributing property in the My Lady's Manor National Register Historic District. Baltimore County Final Landmark, #92. MIHP # BA- 620; County Part 2 tax credit application to replace the existing asphalt roof on the main historic house, with Slate; in-kind asphalt roof replacement on the garage; in-kind rubber membrane roof replacement over the rear kitchen roof; and in-kind gutter replacements [County Council District # 3].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which was removed from the Consent Agenda. Ms. Brannock explained that the proposed work entailed several roof replacements and an in-kind gutter replacement. She added that the house consists of the main historic structure, and an attached garage addition that was added sometime in the 1970s or 1980s before the structure was designated as a County Landmark. The structure also included a rear kitchen addition.

The following work was proposed:

- Replacement of the main historic structure and front porch's existing asphalt roof with slate shingles,
- Replacement of the detached garage's existing asphalt roof in-kind, with asphalt,
- Replacement of the existing flat rubber kitchen roof, in-kind, with a new 60 mil Black EPDM membrane;
- New flashing will be installed where appropriate;
- The gutters on the main house will also be replaced with fabricated 6" Aluminum K-style gutters and 3"x4" downspouts.

Ms. Brannock noted that a small amount of siding will need to be removed in some areas where the roof and flashing was installed incorrectly. Once the new roof is flashed correctly, new in-kind siding will be installed where needed.

Ms. Merritt informed the Commission that the property owners recently changed the proposed asphalt shingle garage roof replacement from gray, to brown asphalt shingles to match the existing color.

Ms. Mundroff asked if the skylights were proposed to be replaced with "V" locks, and if a cut-sheet could be provided to staff. Additionally, Ms. Mundroff asked if the existing roof could support the weight of the new slate, and if there is any evidence that the original structure had a slate roof in the past.

Ms. Merritt introduced the property owner, Mr. Sam Lang.

Mr. Lang said that while he did not have a structural engineer examine the roof framing, the carpenter and roofer did not identify any issues. He added that he would have the roof examined if necessary. Mr. Lang noted that during his home inspections six months ago, the inspector identified issues with the skylights and recommended that they be replaced. Additionally, Mr. Lang shared that he did not find any information on the historic structure roof material type in his search.

Mr. Hord stated that he is less concerned about the skylights, as they are located on the rear of the roof and are not visible from the road. Mr. Hord agreed with Ms. Mundroff that cut-sheets on the skylights be submitted to staff.

Ms. Merritt reminded the Commission that skylights are not eligible for the County Tax Credit, and would not be covered in this application since the skylights are located on the later garage addition.

Ms. Mundroff moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness with the condition that a cut-sheet on the skylights be submitted to staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Holman, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Ms. Novaes, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Hord. One dissenting vote was cast by Mr. Scott Holupka.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Roofs: page 4; County Code Sec. 32-7-405

5. Diggs-Johnson Museum (Friends of Historical Cherry Hill AUMP Inc)., 2426 Offutt Rd, Randallstown; Final Landmark #389- Cherry Hill A.U.M.P Church, Cemetery, and Setting, MIHP # 02399; Free standing sign installation [County Council District # 4].

Mr. Johnson informed the Commission of his involvement with the Diggs-Johnson Museum, and recused himself from discussion and vote. Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved the installation of a sign/informational plaque in the front yard of the museum property. She continued by noting that sign is proposed to be located off the right corner of the east façade that faces Offutt Road, and be situated approximately 10.42' back from the road. The sign design consisted of a single-sided, high-density urethane or HDU, custom painted and sandblasted sign framed by two faux stone pillars on either side.

Ms. Brannock noted that the National Park Service's, Preservation brief #25, contains information for new signage for historic buildings, and recommends that sign materials should be compatible with those of the historic building. A more subtle and simple design for the sign posts be used, in keeping with the simple vernacular style of the structure, was recommended by staff. Ms. Brannock added that a more simple square or rounded wood, or metal post that isn't as wide, would be more visually compatible with the historic structure, rather than using substantial faux stone pillars.

Additionally, staff suggested that the sign be turned, so that it sit perpendicular to the road and, that it be two-sided, so that cars driving in both directions can view the sign. However, this was a suggestion and was not necessarily needed in the LPC review. Per staff recommendation, Ms. Brannock asked the Commission to discuss the pillar/post design.

Ms. McIver agreed with staff recommendations to install a simple, wood sign design and noted that positioning the sign perpendicular to Offutt Road would increase visibility to drivers.

Mr. Hord asked if any of the property owners or applicant wished to speak. Ms. Merritt replied that none were present.

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

Mr. Holman moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the sign installation with the condition that the pillars be a simple wood or steel post, instead of the substantial faux stone pillars. Mr. Weston

seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Ms. Novaes, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Hord. Mr. Johnson recused himself from the vote. There were no dissenting votes.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, National Park Service, Preservation Brief #25, Preservation of Historic Signs, New Signs and Historic Buildings, County Code Sec. 32-7-405.

- **6.** Scott Property, 315 Central Avenue, Glyndon; Contributing property in the Glyndon County Historic District, MIHP #2210; County Part 2 Tax credit application for the In kind, asphalt roof replacement on the detached garage [County Council District # 2].

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

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Roofs: page 4; County Code Sec. 32-7-405

- 7.** Monologue LLC. Property, 209 Central Avenue, Glyndon; Contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District MIHP # BA- 2210; Window and door replacements, new window/door openings, and window reconfigurations. Code Enforcement - Correction Notice # CB220090 [County Council District # 2].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which entailed the ex-post facto approval of several exterior alterations to the structure including the removal and replacement of windows and doors, and creating new window openings. The proposal came to the Planning Department after a correction notice was issued to the property owner.

She continued by describing the various work items. Work Item 1 was the replacement of the pre-existing aluminum storm door and the non-original wood four panel front door. The storm door was replaced with an Anderson Full-View Aluminum Storm Door and the front entry was replaced with a salvaged wood entry-door with 15-true divided lites. Staff noted that while the new front entry was not an appropriate style of door for the architecture style of the structure, they did not feel that it was a detriment to the structure or the district as a whole, and recommended a Notice to Proceed, as completed.

Work Item 2 was completed on the two-story rear addition. The application notes that previous remodeling had reconfigured the first and second story windows to make them smaller to accommodate bathrooms before the property was conveyed to the current owner. The property owner replaced the existing aluminum siding and trim in-kind, and replaced previously existing window replacements with one-over-one Anderson 70 Series Pro Double-Hung vinyl windows. Staff is accepting of the work completed, as it is in-kind, and located on the side of a later rear addition, and recommended to issue a certificate of appropriateness, as completed.

Work Item 3 was completed on the North elevation, of the two-story rear addition: The previous rear elevation contained a single back-door on the first-story of the rear addition, left side. The preexisting door was a wooden ½ lite door with a lower section consisting of two flush panels and an upper glass section of three glass units. The owner replaced the preexisting backdoor with a 38" x 80" 9 Lite Primed Fiberglass Pre-hung back door with brickmould, and created a new door opening on the second-story over the existing door and installed a matching door.

Additionally, the owner created four (4) new window openings that consisted of two (2) windows on the first-story, and two (2) windows on the second-story. Four 1-over-1 Anderson 70 Series Pro Double-Hung vinyl windows were installed. The application notes that the new window openings/installations were made to provide light and ventilation to the rooms that previously contained a single one-over-one vinyl replacement window on the first and second stories, which is on the east side elevation. In addition, the application notes that the new second-story door will provide access to a future deck construction. Staff notified that applicant that any future deck work will need LPC review and approval, as well as a building permit prior to construction.

Staff had no issues with the work and new openings, as it is on the rear later addition, and is located on the rear elevation, not visible from the road, and the door and windows are consistent with what exists. Staff recommended approval as completed. The application states that no work has been conducted, or is planned for the west elevation. However, the entire exterior of the structure will be painted in the future, which is not part of the LPC's purview. Overall, staff was accepting of the work that was complete. Ms. Brannock thanked the applicant for providing the additional information that staff asked for, and added that the clearer photos, elevation drawings, and additional project details, allowed for a better understanding of the site, structure, and entire project.

Ms. Merritt introduced Mr. Greenfeld, the property owner. Mr. Greenfeld stated that he had no further comments, or questions for the Commission.

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

Ms. Mundroff moved to issue a Notice to Proceed for Work Item 1: the front door replacement, as completed; Issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the storm door replacement, as completed; Issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for work items 2 and 3, as completed. Mr. Holupka seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Ms. Novaes, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Hord. There were no dissenting votes.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Windows and Doors: pages 1-8; Porches and Steps: pages 2-4; County Code Sec. 32-7-405

- **8.** Center for Social Change Property, 3601 Briarstone Road; Contributing property in the Fieldstone County Historic District; In-kind asphalt shingle roof replacement [County Council District # 4].

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

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

- 9.** Qadir Property, 3608 Fieldstone Road, Randallstown; contributing structure in the Fieldstone County Historic District; Roof and gutter replacement [County Council District # 4].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved the replacement of the upper portions of the gambrel roof, and replacement of all the existing gutters. The applicant proposed to replace the existing upper roof portions with Landmark Georgetown Gray Asphalt shingles to match existing shingles. The application noted that the slate roofing on the side portions of the gambrel roof will not be replaced. Staff contacted the applicant to clarify the existing material of the upper roof portions, as the photos submitted are not clear.

Ms. Brannock added that the upper roof material appeared to be a smaller slate tile. The Scope of Work submitted from the roofing company only mentioned that slate is existing, and there was no mention of any existing asphalt. From Google street view and Aerials of the property, the existing roof material appeared to be slate. Staff included screenshots of these images in the meeting materials shared with the Commission. Staff recognized that the proposed material color is in keeping the side roof slate, and that the upper portion of the roof has limited visibility from the street. However, clear information about the condition or material of the upper roof was not provided. Staff asked the Commission to get clarification on the existing roof material proposed for replacement. If the material is slate, staff asked for more information about the condition and slate quality to make a decision regarding its replacement.

In addition, the application proposed the in-kind replacement of the existing brown gutters and downspouts, with 5" gutters in the same brown color. Staff was accepting of this proposal and recommend approval for the gutter replacement.

Mr. Weston stated that from the photos provided, the upper roof material appeared to be slate, and observed chipped slate along the edge of the roof. He concluded that this type of wear is indicative of typical slate damage that occurs when a ladder is leaned against slate roofing.

Mr. Weston agreed with staff recommendations and moved to not issue a certificate of appropriateness for the roof replacement as proposed; and to issue a certificate of appropriateness for the gutter replacement, as proposed. Mr. Holman seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Ms. Novaes, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Hord. There were no dissenting votes.

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

- **10.** Johnson Property, 5173 Viaduct Avenue, Relay; Contributing structure in the Relay County Historic District; removal of an existing 10 x 12' frame shed, and replace with a 10x12' frame shed, with wood siding in the same location [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 2-5; County Code Sec. 32-7-405.

- **11.** Womack Property, 516 Sudbrook Lane, Sudbrook Park; Non-Contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District; A new poured concrete parking pad that joins an existing shared drive and concrete walkway replacement Code Enforcement - Correction Notice # CC2201363 [County Council District # 2].

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

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

- 12.** Rutkowski Property, 903 Adana Road, Sudbrook; Contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park Expansion County Historic District; Part 2 Tax Credit Application for Dormer window repairs and associated painting [County Council District # 2].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved a Part 2, tax credit application for repairs to two gable dormer windows located on the second story of the front elevation of the home. The windows are six-over-six double-hung, wood windows and are original to the structure.

Work item 1 consisted of removing damaged wood from each dormer side and replacing it with Azek trim. No information was provided about the Azek material, style, or dimensions. The Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines mention that items be repaired or replaced in kind” and that “missing or deteriorated sections of wood can usually be satisfactorily repaired by means of a Dutchman or other restoration techniques.”

Work Item 2, included the removal of the existing window glazing, and re-glazing with new putty. The window trim will be repainted white after the work is completed.

Overall, staff is accepting of the work. Ms. Brannock noted that Azek material is not an appropriate replacement material, and added that the side trim on the dormers should be repaired using Dutchman repairs or replaced in-kind with the same material (wood), size and dimension.

Ms. Brannock suggested the Commission discuss the use of Hardie plank trim, which would be a more appropriate substitute material, than the Azek. Since the location of the dormer on the 2nd story is not as visible, a substitute material may be considered. The hardie plank must match all existing dimensions and be a flat style with no wood grain.

In addition, the property owner did not submit a contractor’s estimate for the proposed work and staff informed them that one must be submitted prior to work starting. Ms. Brannock reminded the applicant that work expenses must be a minimum of \$1000 to qualify for a County Historic Property Tax Credit.

Mr. Hord asked if the property owner wished to speak. Ms. Merritt replied that they were not present, and added that hardie plank is not an accepted material for tax credits.

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

Mr. Holman agreed with staff recommendations and made a motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions: that the side trim on the dormers should be repaired, using Dutchman repairs or replaced in-kind with wood, matching the size and dimension of the existing. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mundroff, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Ms. Novaes, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Hord. There were no dissenting votes.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Windows and Doors: pages 2-6; County Code Sec. 32-7-405.

- 13.** “Bacon-Crosby House” (2939 Monkton LLC Property), 2939 Monkton Road, Monkton; District. Final Landmarks List # 62 MIHP # BA-0119; Replacement of all existing windows [County Council District # 3].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved the replacement of ALL existing windows on the historic "Bacon-Crosby House." The applicant submitted the proposal on behalf of the property owners, who wish to replace all existing windows with Pella reserve traditional series. The application stated that the existing windows are difficult to operate, have allowed excessive air filtration, and noted that most do not have screens. The application minimally described the condition of the windows and noted that while many windows are old, almost all have been modified or replaced at some point in time. The application and associated materials, did not contain the following information:

- Detail photos that showed the condition of the windows or would help identify the age of the windows;
- Photos that showed that the windows that have been altered or previously replaced;
- Information about the how many windows, the existing material, style, the number of each style, existing dimensions of the windows;
- A conditions assessment from a qualified wood window contractor demonstrating the need to make replacements and that determined which windows are original and which are replacements.

Ms. Brannock added that the Baltimore County Historic Preservation Design guidelines state that historic windows must be retained and repaired, and where deterioration is so severe that repair is impossible, it must be replaced in-kind.

The proposed replacement material, described in the application mentioned aluminum clad exterior with pine interior. County guidelines state that vinyl and metal clad windows are not permitted as replacement material in historic dwellings.

Regardless, the application and proposal submitted did not meet County design guidelines and did not sufficiently demonstrate that the windows needed to be replaced. Ms. Brannock stated that the restoration and repairs to the windows would be tax credit eligible at the County and State level.

Staff did not recommend approval as proposed, and encouraged the applicant and owners to review the guidelines and conduct a window assessment using a qualified historic window contractor.

Ms. Merritt introduced the contractor, Mr. McClees.

Mr. McClees informed the Commission that he is a qualified window inspector/contractor, and had assessed the condition of all existing windows. He determined that some window repairs would only entail removing the trim and replacing in kind, while others only required that the shutters be replaced. Mr. McClees continued that deteriorated window sills would be replaced with newly fabricated window-sills in kind. He assured the Commission that each window would be addressed individually, and added that the property owners are committed to maintaining the historic character of the home.

Mr. Hord thanked Mr. McClees, and stated that the application must document that the windows are not original to the structure.

Ms. McIver added that this property has a history of proposed work that challenged the maintenance of the historic integrity of the dwelling. She reminded the Commission that the first Chairman of the Landmarks Preservation Commission had the property's County Landmark designation written into the

deed, and noted that it should be preserved as such. Ms. McIver concluded her comments by reiterating the need for careful documentation.

Mr. McClees stated that he understood the significance of the historic structure, is aware of the property's work history, and will provide further documentation.

Ms. Mundroff asked for detailed photos of the interior and exterior of the windows in order to determine if the windows can be refurbished, or need to be replaced. She also asked that all window types, size, and condition be provided. Additionally, Ms. Mundroff noted that the window types vary across the three levels, and that each would require a different treatment.

Mr. Hord added that each window needs to be documented and detail why replacements are necessary.

Mr. Johnson agreed that the photos provided made it difficult to determine the existing condition or proposed damage of the windows.

Mr. Hord suggested that each window be treated case-by-case.

Mr. McClees voiced concern that the existing windows are not energy efficient, and noted that the third-story Chippendale style windows are inoperable. He suggested fabricating new replacements and mentioned that energy expenses would accumulate if the windows remained in their present condition.

Mr. Holman thanked Mr. McClees for his additional remarks and acknowledged that wood windows and older buildings do inherently require more care, but nevertheless, a case must be made for each window individually that documents the condition and proposed repairs.

Mr. Hord reassured Mr. McClees that although the windows are not operating well in their present condition, does not mean that they cannot be repaired to work well. He added that installing storm windows could help improve energy efficiency. To conclude his comments, Mr. Hord reiterated that evidence must be shown that the windows cannot be repaired, and if they can be repaired, there are County Tax Credit benefits available for in-kind window repairs and replacements.

Ms. Evans-Letocha encouraged the applicant to communicate with staff for additional feedback, and moved to not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the window replacements as proposed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Holman, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans-Letocha, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Ms. Novaes, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Hord. There were no dissenting votes.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Windows and Doors: pages 2-6; County Code Sec. 32-7-405.

- **14.** Little Valley and Setting (Lankford Property), 1940 Rushley Road, Parkville; Final Landmark # 378 MIHP # BA-3267; Tax Credit Part 2 Application - Repairs to existing wood screen door, and the installation of three new wood screen doors, that will be replicated to match the existing screen door; sand and repaint all four entry doors [County Council District # 5].

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

- **15.** Ferguson Property, 786 Glen Ave, Ellicott City; Contributing structure in the Oella National Register Historic District; Part II approval for painting the porch, and corner trim piece in-kind replacement [county council district #1].

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

Citing Baltimore County Historic Preservation Guidelines – Façade Materials; National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, Preservation Brief # 10 – Painting - County Code, Sec 11-2-201 County Code Sec. 32-7-405.

Other Business

Ms. Brannock informed the Commission that the following historic property tax credit applications were approved by staff following the receipt of Part II approval for work reviewed by the Maryland Historic Trust:

Nachtman Property, 325 Morris Avenue, Lutherville; MHT approval for in-kind porch roof and railing installation; exterior Painting; window repair/restoration [County Council District #3]

Clifton Property, 803 Kingston Road, Stoneleigh; MHT approval for window replacements [County Council District #5]

Ms. Merritt announced that the Baltimore County Department of Planning was awarded two, Certified Local Government Grants by the Maryland Historical Trust. First, was the Education and Training Grant for \$1,500, which will be used for Commission and Staff training. The second, was a conditional offer for a project grant from the County Design Guidelines program. Staff is awaiting the final amount confirmation, but could be awarded up to \$13,000.

Mr. Holman thanked Mr. Hord for leading the meeting.

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

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 PM.

JCB:jcb