

**Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission**  
**July 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 6:01 p.m. Through the meeting, the following Commission members were:

Present

Ms. Phoebe Evans Letocha  
Ms. Jamie Ferguson  
Mr. John Holman, Chair  
Mr. Scott Holupka  
Ms. Selisa Jefferson  
Mr. Vincent Johnson  
Ms. Wendy McIver  
Ms. Lili Mundroff  
Mr. Christopher Parts  
Mr. Christopher Weston

Not Present

Mr. Ed Hord, Vice-Chair  
  
Ms. Marina Novaes  
Mr. Raymond Scott

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

**1. Review of the Agenda**

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

**2. Approval of the Minutes**

Mr. Holman asked if anyone proposed changes to the June 9<sup>th</sup>, 2022 Minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Holman asked for a motion to approve the Minutes as written. Mr. Parts moved to approve the minutes, which was seconded by Mr. Holupka . The motion passed with affirmative voice votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

**3. Consent Agenda**

Ms. Brannock read the Action Recommendations for Consent Agenda Items 6, 8, 10, and 13.

Mr. Holman asked if anyone wished to discuss the Consent Agenda Items further. Ms. Mundroff stated she had comments on Item 8, the Russell Property. Agenda Item 8 was removed from the Consent Agenda to be discussed later in the meeting. Mr. Holman asked for a motion for the Consent Agenda

Items 6, 10, and 13. Mr. Weston moved to approve the consent agenda items, as proposed, and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for Agenda Items 6, 10, and 13. Mr. Parts seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

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

4. “Oak Grove and Setting” (The Pamela T. Warfield Revocable Trust Property), 1822 Frederick Road, Catonsville; Public Hearing on Nomination to the Preliminary Landmarks List – “Oak Grove and Setting” [County Council District #1].

Ms. Merritt introduced the agenda item, and presented the property’s history, significance, and staff’s evaluation. Below is a summary of the information presented at the meeting:

#### **Summary**

*Oak Grove, is a historic property located on the north side of Frederick Road, less than a mile west of downtown Catonsville. Currently, the just under 1-acre lot, is improved with a 3-story Second Empire house with Queen Anne characteristics. The location of the property along Frederick Road, has a historical association to the development of the National Road and Catonsville. The original property was most likely improved sometime between 1834 and 1840, with a 2-story stone structure with a hipped roof, by Peter Hause, a local landowner and businessman. In 1886, under the ownership of Samuel D. Helfrich, the house was extensively renovated to reflect the Victorian architectural styles that were popular during the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, and were reflected in other homes constructed in Catonsville. The property continues to be residential property today.*

*The property is situated between two existing Baltimore County Landmarks, the “Hause-Phillips House” (Manro’s Tavern and Maidstone) Landmark #63 to the right, and the “Robert Townsend House” (Catonsville Historical Society) Landmark #193 to the left. The property’s history is closely associated with Landmark #63, the “Hause-Phillips House” or Manro’s Tavern.*

#### **Evaluation & Recommendation**

*After reviewing the submitted nomination and conducting additional research, Staff has determined, that the “Oak Grove” and its setting is eligible for the Baltimore County Landmarks list, under the submitted justifications for Criteria 1, for historic associations and 2 for its architecture.*

*The structure has a historic association with Peter Hause and association with development along National Road, both contributed in the growth and development of Catonsville and surrounding area. Even though that the house and setting have been altered, the property still retains some integrity in design, location, and setting to convey those associations.*

*The historic setting associated with the Hause and Helfrich eras, no longer exists. The present property, was the result of the subdivision of larger estate lots, which was a common trend locally and nationally, and follows historic development patterns in the area. Overall, on the present setting, the house still remains in its original orientation and location on the property.*

*Although, the property has lost some of its exterior material integrity with the covering of the stone and wood siding with vinyl, the overall form and major character defining features have been relatively unaltered and are still visible. The mansard roof and corner Tower are major character defining features that are associated with the Second Empire and Queen Anne styles of architecture. Since the current visual appearance of the house is associated with the major changes made under Helfrich’s ownership,*

*the period of significance for the house would be c. 1885 to 1949, rather than that of the property's construction date.*

Mr. Holman asked if the property owner was present. Ms. Merritt said that he was present. Mr. John Higbie, thanked Staff for their presentation, and did not have anything to add. There was no additional public testimony for or against the proposed nomination.

Mr. Holman asked if the Commission had any discussion or questions. Ms. Evans Letocha asked if there are other properties in Catonsville of a similar style and period that are included on the Final Landmarks List. Ms. Merritt responded that there are three National Register Historic Districts within Catonsville, and that several properties are listed on the Landmarks list as well as the National Register.

Ms. Evans Letocha asked if any of the other properties were examples of the Queen Anne, Second Empire style. Ms. Merritt responded that there are several, and that an Italianate structure had undergone similar rehabilitation as the Oak Grove property.

Ms. Mundroff asked if there was consideration to the setting, and how the home, in conjunction with the other neighboring Landmarks will be perceived. Ms. Merritt replied that only one structure is associated with the property, the tavern; and that the other was constructed in the 20<sup>th</sup> century and is not related to the Oak Grove property. Ms. Merritt further explained the "Historical Environmental Setting" delineation is used to add a buffer from any future development on the property.

With no further discussion, Mr. Holman asked for a motion.

Mr. Parts made the motion to place "Oak Grove and Setting" on the Preliminary Landmarks List, following Staff's recommendation that the property meet's Criteria 1, for historic association with the development of Catonsville and 2, as an example of Second Empire and Queen Anne styles of architecture. The motion was seconded by Ms. McIver which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

*Citing Baltimore County Code 32-7-302; National Register Bulletin "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation."*

5. "Paradise Place at Sudbrook Assisted Living Property", 600 Sudbrook Road, Sudbrook Park; Contributing property in the Sudbrook Park, County Historic District, MIHP # 3040; Ex-post facto review for a Paved commercial parking lot; Code Enforcement Correction Notice # CB 2200393 [County Council District #2].

Ms. Brannock introduced the Agenda Item, which involved the installation of a 3,800 sqft paved parking lot. Ms. Brannock informed the Commission that Staff was contacted by community members, and subsequently a Correction Notice was issued in June 2022. No permit was filed for the grading and there was not review by the Commission.

The new asphalt parking lot is located to the rear of the property and is accessed from Carysbrook Road. The new lot expands the previously existing gravel driveway and parking area, and extends up to the Carriage House (which the LPC approved plans for its rehab in July 2020, and staff approved plans in an Emergency Review after a tree fell on the structure in November 2020).

The new lot contains eight (8) regular parking spaces, and two (2) handicap spaces will be painted and identified with signage.

From the Google street view, the previous lot began at Carysbrook Road, and was located in and terminated at a concentration of three large deciduous trees, pines, and flowering shrubs. Images from June 2022 indicate that the vegetation has been removed.

Updated site plans from June 22, 2022 show the expanded parking lot that will meet the existing brick walkway leading to the main house.

Ms. Brannock shared staff's concerns with the parking lot's close proximity to the carriage house, and the impacts to the future work to the carriage house, and noted that the lot location should have been sited away from the Carriage House. Staff recommended that a proper landscape plan be submitted that provides more details. The current site plan did not show the previously existing conditions. Nor did it show the walkway from the parking lot to the house.

In addition, no information was provided in the application about the Zoning requirements for parking associated with small scale ALF. A copy of the ALF permit application, from August 2021, was submitted with the application, yet it did not provide any details if the parking lot meets zoning requirements, and there is no record of the ALF permit being issued.

Staff recommended that the applicant address the necessary zoning requirements with the Office of Zoning and return to the LPC with a proper landscape plan, or more a detailed site plan.

Ms. Merritt introduced the property owner, Ms. Johnson.

Ms. Johnson informed the Commission that the Office of Zoning was consulted throughout the construction process and that materials were submitted to secure a Building Permit. Ms. Johnson noted that the previous parking lot was in poor condition, and that the Office of Zoning provided guidance on the number of parking spaces, beds within the assisted living community, and ALF requirements. Ms. Johnson believed there was a miscommunication, and that it was her understanding that the Building Permit was approved. Additionally, Ms. Johnson stated that the Carriage House was approved for demolition by the engineer, and was to be rebuilt in kind. Ms. Johnson reassured the Commission that she wants to follow the design guidelines and add to the community, not to detract from the history of the property.

Mr. Holman thanked Ms. Johnson for providing her testimony, and added the following clarifying points: 1). the LPC has not approved the demolition and rebuild of the Carriage House; and 2) there is no record of the Office of Zoning having approved the parking lot as constructed, regardless of the advice and guidance provided.

Ms. Johnson was not aware that a Zoning Permit was required in addition to a Building Permit.

Mr. Holman suggested that Ms. Johnson communicate to her architect that they address the issues discussed with the Office of Zoning.

Ms. Merritt announced that the Commission had received several letters of support and opposition concerning the parking lot. She confirmed that the letters were circulated to the Commissioners prior to

the meeting. Many of the letters shared the same sentiments and offered the same examples in their testimonies. To avoid redundancy, Ms. Merritt summarized the main points of opposition as the following: conducting the work without a building permit, the location, visual appearance, lack of landscaping, and storm water management, commercial vs. residential property, work performed by unlicensed workers concerns.

Ms. Merritt introduced Ms. Cheryl Heb, a former neighbor. Ms. Heb stated that she was one of the first individuals to approach the property owners when they purchased 600 Sudbrook Road, and confirmed that the owners were aware of the permitting process required of the historic property. In addition to the parking lot construction, there is concern with widening the pathway leading to the front entry. During this processes, an original brick wall was moved as the pathway was expanded. Ms. Heb felt that this change does not align with the original intent and layout of the historic house. Further, there was no mitigation between the new parking lot and the curb, and storm water management was not considered. Ms. Heb suggested gravel, or an impervious material be used to allow for better drainage, and may blend more seamlessly with the property. Ms. Heb added that trees were removed from the existing parking area by an unlicensed contractor, which she believed led to trees falling on top of the Carriage House, causing considerable damage. Ms. Heb concluded her comments and asked that the Commission consider the impact of the parking lot on the historic character of the home and neighborhood.

Mr. Holman thanked Ms. Heb for her testimony.

Ms. Merritt introduced Mr. Deane Rundell, president of the Sudbrook Park Neighborhood Association. Mr. Rundell is a landscape architect and suggested the following points to address landscape and view shed mitigation concerns: to move the parking lot closer to the main house, so it may have the appearance of a residential driveway from the right-of-way; to situate the handicapped spaces closer to the walkway instead of at the edge of the lot; and to install proper landscaping that will mitigate stormwater to the lawn instead of the road and surrounding neighbors.

Ms. Merritt introduced Ms. Wendy Sutherland. Ms. Sutherland reiterated that she sent a letter to the Commission and is in favor of the parking lot as constructed, and noted that she disagrees with previously stated sentiments that the entire community is against the work. Ms. Sutherland noted that considerable discussion has taken place on the Sudbrook Park neighborhood Facebook page, and that many members are in favor of the work that the owners have put into the home. Ms. Sutherland added that the size and location of the new parking lot is the same as the previous layout.

Mr. Holman thanked the speakers for their testimonies and added that the Commission is obligated to review any work made to historic properties against the historic design guidelines, and remand work to the Office of Zoning as necessary.

Ms. McIver asked if the owner did not have approval with Zoning, why they proceeded with the work.

Ms. Johnson replied that she had never owned a historic property before and is working to follow the guidelines. She noted that the parking lot needed to be constructed for the assisted living facility. Mr. Holman asked if she received guidance or approval from the Office of Zoning. Ms. Johnson replied that she followed the guidance of Zoning with the drawings and architects, and was issued a building permit.

Mr. Parts reiterated that Ms. Johnson was issued a building permit and asked if this was correct. Ms. Merritt clarified that a permit was approved for work done to the historic home, but not to the parking lot, which is separate from the Commission's review of the previous work. She added that the Commission never received plans for the parking lot, only for the exterior rehabilitation of the house, and that if the owners applied for a grading permit, Preservation Services would have been flagged.

Ms. McIver noted that the previous lot was a pervious surface and acted as a buffer to stormwater management, adding that there should have been clear communication from the Office of Zoning to address stormwater concerns.

Ms. Mundroff asked to clarify if the plans for the parking lot had ever been submitted to the Permitting Office. Ms. Merritt answered that no site plans were submitted.

Mr. Weston directed the Commission to the Paradise Place Assisted Living site plan that was submitted in the July 2022 Historic Review Application, and noted that the plans appear to label the parking lot as constructed. Mr. Weston stated that there was no grading information, or surface coverage, and that the "site plan" is better described as a "layout plan."

Ms. Merritt stated that the owners will need to submit a detailed site plan, grading permit, and will need to go through the proper channels for building permits before returning to the Commission.

Mr. Parts wished to clarify whether or not the Commission had reviewed and approved work to demolish the Carriage House. Ms. Merritt responded that the Commission can only discuss the parking lot at this time, but, added that the rehabilitation was approved in the past for the Carriage House. Any change to the scope of work that was previously was approved would need to return to the Commission under a new application.

Ms. Evans Letocha moved to not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or Notice to proceed for the parking lot as completed. The motion was seconded by Ms. McIver, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

Mr. Holman thanked Ms. Johnson for all the work that has been done to bring the historic home back to life, and thanked the neighbors for providing their comments.

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

- \*\*6.** "Monologue LLC. Property", 209 Central Avenue, Glyndon; Contributing property in the Glyndon, County Historic District; MIHP #2210; Replacement of two, non-historic exterior doors on the rear elevation. [County Council District #2].

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

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Guidelines, Windows and Doors: pages 1-8. County code 32-7-304.*

- 7.** Edelen Property, 1909 Monkton Road, Monkton; Contributing structure in the Monkton, County Historic District; MIHP # BA- 2210; various alterations to siding, window, and door replacements; deck construction [County Council District #3].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved a series of exterior alterations to the 19<sup>th</sup> century, vernacular style, I-house.

Work item number one consisted of replacing the existing deteriorated wood shingles on all elevations with James Hardie lap siding with a 7 inch exposure. The proposed work will include demo of all shingles. Repair sheathing and areas with rot. Apply Tyvek vapor barrier before installing new siding.

Work item two involved work to the front porch. The application stated that the existing wood porch floorboards and framing are rotted. The porch floor will be repaired and where needed, deteriorated elements will be removed and replaced in-kind with tongue and groove yellow pine, then primed and painted. The updated scope mentions the porch framing is rotted, but no work to the framing was mentioned, just the floor board in-kind replacement. Staff asked the Commission, in their report to get some more details about this from the applicant.

For work item three, the applicant wished to remove and replace ALL existing windows and any associated metal storm windows. The proposed replacements were Marvin Infinity six-over-six, double-hung 30 3/8" X 45 1/2" windows, with simulated divided lite sashes, to be wood or fiberglass. Existing window openings will be repaired, flashed before new windows are installed. Rot and damage to the existing window flashing, jamb, apron, and frame were noted for all.. Staff noted that it appeared that the existing wood windows may have been previous replacements made in the early 20th century, based on the muntin profile.

In addition, the application proposed changing three existing windows and adding a new window opening. Details for each elevation are as follows:

On the Front elevation –

- five existing 6/6 wood windows to be replaced.

On the Rear elevation-

- 2nd Floor: two existing 6/6 windows to be replaced; existing 8-sided middle window to be replaced with a 6/6 window and centered on the façade
- 1st Floor: Removal of the existing 6/6 kitchen window and installing a larger, paired sliding window, that will be aligned vertically with the windows above.

South Elevation –

- 1st floor: removal of existing Garden window, and expanding the opening to create a new doorway, and installing Dutch door
- 2nd floor: on the south/side elevation Creation of a new window opening where one does not exist. New window to match the other replacements

Staff noted that our Guidelines states that changing the location, covering-up, changing the dimensions of a window opening, or adding new windows is typically not appropriate treatment. But that enlarging or adding a window at the rear, or other portions of the house, that are not visible from the street, may be appropriate if the proposal respects the historic character of the house.

Work item four consisted of work to the exterior doors on the house. The existing front door will be repaired.

On the rear elevation the applicant proposed the removal of an existing, single wood exterior door, enclosing the space, and then covering with new siding.

In addition, the owners proposed the replacement of an existing modern sliding door with a new Marvin Infinity French doors with divided lights.

A new Dutch door was proposed to be installed on the south side elevation, in the same location of an existing kitchen garden window, which will be removed and the opening expanded to accommodate the new door.

Work item five called for the removal of the existing wood shutters and to be replaced with wood custom louver style from Timberline Shutters. Staff was accepting of this as the existing shutters are not appropriate style or hung correctly. Staff noted that hardware evidence of shutters previously existing on the house is present on the window frames. No information about how the new shutters will be hung was provided in the application.

Staff was accepting of the proposal for the shutters, and recommended that a condition for approval be that the shutters are hung correctly so that they are operable.

Work item six was the proposal for the construction of a grade level yellow pine wood deck along the side and rear elevations of the house.

Ms. Merritt introduced the homeowner, Mr. Andrew Edelen. Mr. Edelen thanked the Commission for their consideration and stated that he was available for questions.

Ms. Mundroff asked if there was consideration to step the side deck back a few feet so that the deck construction does not immediately align with or impact the front elevation of the home.

Mr. Parts noted that if the original siding is to be retained, the new window flashing may need to cut into the siding during the installation process, and asked that this work be carried out as necessary.

Mr. Weston moved to issue a Vote to Issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following Work Items:

- Work Item 1, with the condition that the wood lapped siding underneath the shingles to remain under the new siding. In the event that the siding underneath is found to be in a greater deteriorated condition throughout that prevents the new siding to be safely installed, the applicant shall contact our office and provide documentation for our files;
- Work Item 2, repair and in-kind replacement of front porch floor, as proposed;
- Work Item 3, with the condition that the window replacements be wood;
- Work Item 4, as proposed.
- Work Item 5, with the condition that the shutters are hung correctly so that they are operable, not screwed into the siding;
- Work Item 6, with the condition that the front edge of the deck be held back two feet from the front elevation of the house.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Parts, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.



*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Façade Materials: pages 1-12, Windows and Doors: pages 2-6, Porches and Steps: pages 1-6. County Code Sec. 32-7-405*

- \*\*8.** Russell Property, 333 West Seminary Avenue; Contributing property in the Lutherville County Historic District; Replacement of 6 1/1 wood windows in a 2-story bay window, located in a non-historic rear addition, with 4/4 wood windows to match the rest of the house [County Council District #3].

Ms. Mundroff requested this item's removal from the Consent agenda. Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved the replacement of six, builder grade 1-over-1, windows in a 2-story bay window situated on a non-historic rear addition that was constructed in 1997. The proposed replacements were 4/4 wood windows, to better match the windows on the historic section of the house.

Ms. Merritt introduced the homeowner, Mr. Russell. Mr. Russell shared that the existing wood windows had snap-in grids that fell apart, and that the construction of the bay window was made with every consideration to maintain the historic character of the home. He felt that replacing the 1/1 windows to match other existing 4/4 windows, would be in keeping with the original windows.

The Commission received a letter from the Lutherville Advisory Committee, suggesting that the proposed 4/4 windows be changed to 1/1 or 2/2 to distinguish the new bay from the historic portion of the home.

Ms. Evans Letocha asked if the addition and 4/4 windows was approved by the Commission in 1997.

Mr. Russell stated that the windows were milled to match the existing windows, and that at the time, historic preservation standards were designed to blend the new work with the existing historic conditions. It was constructed before our current design guidelines were written.

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

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

- 9.** Rutkowski Property, 903 Adana Road, Sudbrook Park; Contributing Resource - County Historic District: Sudbrook Park Expansion #2 – Adana Road; Part II approval HVAC system replacement and chimney and repointing [County Council District #2].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved the installation of a new gas furnace and air conditioning unit, replacing the existing 20 year old unit; and repointing mortar in portions of the exterior and to the chimney.

Ms. Brannock noted that no information was provided in the application about the existing or proposed joint type or mortar composition. Staff recommended a condition for approval be that the mortar used for repairs is compatible with the existing material, and is not 100% Portland cement, and that the color

and joint style match the existing. Ms. Brannock added that this information can be provided to staff in an updated estimate for the work from the contractor, before the start of work to be tax credit eligible.

The Commission had no further questions or discussion.

Mr. Holupka left the meeting around 7:45pm.

Mr. Parts agreed with staff recommendations and moved to Issue a Certificate of Appropriateness as proposed for Work Item 1, and conditional approval for Work Item 2, with the conditions that the proposed mortar is compatible with the existing, and that this information is to be provided to staff prior to work beginning. The motion was seconded by Ms. McIver, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Roofs: pages 3-13. County Code Sec. 32-7-405, & Sec. 11-2-201. National Park Service Preservation Brief # 2 Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings.*

- \*\*10.** “Beverley Property, 16202 Corbett Village Lane, Monkton; Contributing structure in the Corbett County Historic District; Play set installation [County Council District #3].

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.** “Glyndon Bank” Romay Property, 4817 Butler Road, Glyndon; Contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District; MIHP # BA-2210; Ex-post facto review of exterior signage, Code Enforcement Correction Notice # CB2100788 [County Council District #2].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved exterior signage placed on the front facade of 4817 Butler Road, a two-story brick building that historically served the Glyndon community as a bank. Ms. Brannock added that the structure was constructed c. 1931 in the colonial revival style, and although the structure is a non-contributing resource in the district (as it falls outside Glyndon’s period of significance, which ends around 1915), it has “acquired significance” on its own as a prominent building on Butler Road, the community’s main thoroughfare. The property is older than 50 years, and architecturally, has merit to be individually listed on the National Register or as a County Landmark. Non-contributing properties are reviewed within the building’s context – meaning its age, architectural style, and location of the structure and its relationship with the historic district.

Ms. Brannock reminded the Commission that the property owner was seeking ex-post facto approval for a commercial sign installation for the second time, and provided the following brief review and timeline of the case:

In July 2020, Dr. Leah Romay purchased the building, and contacted staff for information on projects needing review. Staff explained all exterior alterations required LPC review and a permit, and was provided a copy of the Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines. Prior, to Dr. Romay’s ownership, the building was the “Glyndon Family Dentistry,” whose sign was located above the door, not obstructing the “Glyndon Bank” sign—a character defining feature.

In mid-April 2021, Dr. Romay installed a new, “Baltimore Dentist Co.” sign at the top of the building, covering up the original “Glyndon Bank” sign. The “Baltimore Dental Co.” sign measures 144” x 20” in length. The text is white with a serif style font, set against a black background with a circular mint leaf design placed in the leftmost corner. The sign is mounted to the brick mortar on the front façade.

In late July 2021, a Glyndon neighbor contacted staff to see if the sign had been approved and properly permitted, which it had not. In early December 2021, Code Enforcement issued a Correction Notice directing the property owner to contact staff to rectify the issue. (As a note, staff originally contacted Code Enforcement July 2021, however there was a miscommunication on the Correction Notice being issued, which is why it was not issued until December.)

The property owner first submitted an ex-post facto application earlier this year, and was reviewed by the LPC at its February 10th, 2022 meeting. At that meeting, the LPC voted to NOT issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or Notice to Proceed, as completed and required the sign to be removed and located in an alternative location that does not obstruct the “Glyndon Bank”. The LPC cited the National Park Service’s Technical Preservation Brief #25, The Preservation of Historic Signs in their review.

Ms. Brannock reiterated that Dr. Romay has again submitted an application seeking ex-post facto approval, for a commercial sign installed. In the proposal, the owner states that her reasoning for covering up the sign was because people were not aware that the building was being used as a dental office, because the previous signage was too small, and has noted that the new sign has brought more attention to the building and its current use.

In addition, the owner mentioned in her application that in our design guidelines there is no mention of exterior signage which is why she did not seek approval. However, adding a sign to the exterior of a building is considered an alteration and therefore requires a review. In addition, commercial signage requires a building permit, regardless if the structure is in a historic district or not. If a building permit was applied for, our office would have been flagged and LPC review and approval required before a permit can be signed off on.

Preservation Brief # 25, The Preservation of Historic Signs, states the following points should be considered when designing and constructing new signs for historic buildings:

- Sign placement is important: new signs should not obscure significant features of the historic building.
- New signs should also respect neighboring buildings. They should not shadow or overpower adjacent structures.
- Sign materials should be compatible with those of the historic building. Materials characteristic of the building's period and style, used in contemporary designs, can form effective new signs.
- New signs should be attached to the building carefully, both to prevent damage to historic fabric, and to ensure the safety of pedestrians. Fittings should penetrate mortar joints rather than brick, for example, and sign loads should be properly calculated and distributed

Ms. Brannock acknowledged that while Staff appreciated the information provided about how the sign was attached to the building, that Staff still had concerns over the location of the sign, as the new sign obscures a significant feature of the structure. Ms. Brannock noted again that the Commission reviews non-contributing structures within the building’s context – meaning its age, architectural style, the location of the structure and its relationship with the historic district. The engraved, “Glyndon Bank”

sign is a character defining feature for the structure and should not have been covered up with new signage.

For the second time, Staff recommended that the new sign be removed and reinstalled in an alternative location that does not obscure and character defining features or the structure. Recommendations included the same location as the previous dental office's sign for "Glyndon Family Dentistry" sign, a free standing in front of the building, a decal/etched signage on the glass entry door (used in combination with another option).

Ms. Merritt introduced the property owner, Dr. Leah Romay.

Dr. Romay stated that signage should fit within the original signboard and that her sign sits within the original board as intended. She continued that the previous "Glyndon Family Dentistry" sign positioned below the "Glyndon Bank" sign was very small, and that etching her sign onto the front entry glass door would not be visible from the road. Dr. Romay added that a leader in the Glyndon Community Association informed her that the building is not significant to Glyndon's history, and that concern over covering of the words "Glyndon Bank" was not merited. She stated that there are no other buildings in the district in the same style as the c. 1931 Glyndon Bank, and for a building to be considered "iconic" there would need to be similar buildings in a similar style, built at the same time. She confirmed that she did not apply for a permit to install the sign, and was informed by AA Signs that the company does not apply for permits for small projects like hers, as the projects tend to "fly under the radar" and that "no one really cares because no lights would be installed." Dr. Romay concluded her comments by stating that there was no space to place a standing sign at the front of the building.

Mr. Weston stated that he believed it was confusing to have two signs on the front of the building, and that it is important for the sign to be legible from the road. He added that the sign was tasteful and believed that the architect's intent was for a sign to be placed above the door. Mr. Weston concluded his comments by acknowledging that while he appreciates the historic guidelines, his personal opinion is that the current sign placement is okay.

Mr. Johnson asked if the owner needed to receive a permit for the sign installation. Ms. Merritt replied that a permit was required, but was not submitted and added that if a permit was applied for, Preservation Services would have been notified, and the proposed work would have been reviewed by the Commission.

Mr. Holman added that the Commission has no authority to issue permits, and that regardless of the Commission's decision, the sign is still not in compliance with Baltimore County since it has not undergone the appropriate permitting process.

Ms. Evans Letocha acknowledged that the sign company had provided Dr. Romay inaccurate information on the permit requirements.

Mr. Parts stated that he was uninformed on the National Park Service's (NPS) stance on non-contributing structures and asked if the interpretation is open-ended.

Mr. Holman responded that staff are obligated to follow the guidelines, and if the Commission wished to vary from them, it is within their purview.

Ms. Merritt introduced Mr. Maxim Doroshenko, who clarified that he is an “in family” attorney advising Dr. Romy, but is not representing her in a legal capacity. Mr. Doroshenko stated that he believes the NPS Preservation Briefs support the sign placement over the “Glyndon Bank” engraving, as the sign was properly secured to the mortar, in the place where a sign was intended to sit. He added that the sign placement protects the historic feature from the elements and enhances its preservation. Mr. Doroshenko referred to the Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines and noted that while it is mentioned that historic signage should not be covered, there is no information on sign placement. He concluded his comments by stating that the only solution that exists is to maintain the sign in its current placement, and acknowledged that while the sign does cover the historic engraving, it simultaneously preserves it for future use if the building is ever added to the Landmarks list, and is otherwise depriving the owner of displaying their sign in a reasonable place.

Ms. McIver reiterated staff comments that the building has acquired historic significance and is an example of Depression Era architecture within Glyndon, regardless of its “non-contributing” status within Glyndon’s period of significance, and should not be dismissed as insignificant to the historic landscape of Glyndon.

Mr. Holman reminded the Commission that when moving forward with the motion, the decision must be based on the historic guidelines, not their own personal thoughts. He instructed the Commission to state the motion in such a way that it fits within the guidelines, as well as acknowledge the need for a sign permit.

Ms. Merritt advised that the motion would need to be a “Notice to proceed” and not a “Certificate of Appropriateness,” as the completed installation did not undergo LPC review or receive approval. The owner will still need to apply for a sign permit in order to close out the active citation with Code Enforcement.

Mr. Weston made a motion to issue a Notice to Proceed for the sign as installed with the condition that a sign permit be secured. The motion was seconded by Mr. Parts, with affirmative votes cast by Mr. Johnson, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. Dissenting votes were cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Ms. Jefferson, Ms. McIver, and Ms. Mundroff. The motion did not carry. The Commission proceeded with staff recommendations and Ms. McIver made a motion to Issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the removal of the sign and install in the same location as the previous dental office’s sign; or consider alternative signage/location options that do not obscure character defining features. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mundroff, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, and Ms. Mundroff. Dissenting votes were cast by Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman.

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

**12. “Ashland Public School”, Tiede Property, 200 Ashland Road, Ashland [County Council District #3]**

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved a series of exterior updates to the rear of the home:

Ms. Brannock introduced Work Item 1: a 14'x11' bathroom addition over the existing mudroom (a non-historic addition), located on the rear, where the two historic portions of the structure meet, creating a rear "ell". The bathroom addition will create a large shed dormer sheathed with James Hardie shake straight edge with a GAF slateline asphalt roof, exterior soffit and trim details will consist of Azek Trim Synthetic Trim Boards. It will have Anderson 400 Series simulated divided lite casement windows -two on the rear elevation and on the west elevation, a pair at the center with one window at either side. The mudroom roof will be hipped, covered with GAF slateline shingles A custom milled crown cornice detail will be milled to match the original structure detail. Copper, ½" round gutters and downspouts will be installed.

Staff recommended approval with the condition the new cornice detail on the new mudroom roof be a different material or a more simple design, to help differentiate the old from the new, as stated in our design guidelines, which can be done using a different material.

Ms. Brannock introduced Work Item 2: to replace the existing vinyl sliding door on the rear mudroom's west elevation, with a custom design 64"x 84" solid mahogany entry door with a ¾ lite glass panel. Staff recommended approval as proposed.

Ms. Brannock introduced Work Item 3: to replace the existing vinyl double hung windows on the south elevation of the rear Mudroom with a pair of Simulated Divided Lite 400 Series Andersen Casement Windows. Staff recommends approval as proposed.

Ms. Brannock introduced Work Item 4: to cover the existing mudroom gray tile/brick with a stone cottonwood limestone tumbled veneer. Our guidelines state that additions should be differentiated from the historic structure. Staff does not recommend approval as proposed and recommends the owners select a material that does not replicate the stone of the historic structure.

Ms. Brannock introduced Work Item 5: to construct a kitchen 11 x 24 kitchen addition on the rear elevation. It will be built on a monolithic slab foundation and be stepped in slightly on either side of the existing structure. The existing window opening, on the rear will be expanded and used as the entry to the new kitchen. It will have a hipped standing seam metal roof. The existing exterior stone wall will remain exposed in the new kitchen's interior. The exterior walls will consist of 4" US Stone Cottonwood tumbled Limestone, in order to match the existing stone. A ribbon of six, Andersen 400 series casement windows with stimulated divided light, will be on the rear elevation of the proposed addition.

Ms. Brannock informed the Commission that Staff is accepting of the over location and general design of the proposed kitchen addition. In addition, staff appreciates the property owners wish to make the addition match the historic structure, however, our design guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Historic Rehabilitation, state that new additions/features must be differentiated from the original building. When new work is highly replicative and indistinguishable from the old in appearance, it may no longer be possible to identify the "real" historic building from later additions.

Staff recommended that the owners select a different kind of exterior material, perhaps a smaller coursed stone, or a gray brick; or using a wide lapped hardie plank or board and batten. Staff encourages the Commission to discuss and provide suggestions of compatible and appropriate materials to help differentiating the addition (and the Mudroom) from the original structure.

Ms. Merritt introduced the property owner, Mr. Tiede.

Mr. Tiede was agreeable to selecting a new material and asked the Commission if stucco was a suitable choice for the exterior siding.

Mr. Tiede stated that he would prefer to use a masonry product on the lower level of the home.

Mr. Weston suggested installing a stone base beneath the window sills along the rear addition.

Ms. Mundroff asked if there was an alternate material to the tumbled stone, and if a material with a more defined edge, or more fine coarse stone, could be used to differentiate the addition. She added that if stucco were to be proposed, she would like to see the specifications.

Mr. Holman and Ms. Merritt responded that updated materials would need to be resubmitted to Staff and included in their permit application.

Mr. Parts moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for -

- for work item #1, bathroom addition, with the condition that the cornice detail be a different material, or a more simple style be used, rather than replicating wood cornice to match the detail on the historic structure;
- Work Items # 2, mudroom door replacement; and # 3, mudroom window replacement, as proposed.
- NOT issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or Notice to Process for work items # 4, and 5, because the proposed exterior materials do not differentiate the new work from the historic structure, and to submit updated plans to the subcommittee for review and final approval.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Johnson, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Façade Materials: pages 1-12, Windows and Doors: pages 2-6, Additions and Infill: pages 1-6. NPS, Preservation Brief #14 New Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns County Code Sec. 32-7-405*

- \*\*13.** “Hereford High School Barn”, (Board of Education of Baltimore County Property), 17301 York Road, Parkton; Final Landmarks List #132 – Hereford High School Barn, MIHP # BA- 2643 [County Council District; Metal roof replacement, siding rehabilitation, trim repairs, lighting installation, structural support installation, and door repairs #3].

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

*Baltimore County Code Section 32-7-403 citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Façade Materials.*

**To be reported:**

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

- “Stoneleigh Shopping Center + Setting”, Final Landmark; Part II approval for commercial rehabilitation project [County Council District #5]
- Wales Property, 31 Dunkirk Road, Rodgers Forge; ER Part II approval for AC unit replacement [County Council District #5]
- Lang Property, 16620 Wesley Chapel Rd., Monkton; ER approval for abandoned leaking oil tank removal [County Council District #3]
- “Day Village” MCAP Day Village LLC Property, 511 North Avondale Road, Dundalk; Part II Tax Credit approval for commercial rehabilitation [County Council District #7]
- Agar Property, 141 Stanmore Road, Rodgers Forge; ER Part II approval for in-kind roof repairs [County Council District #5]

**Other Business**

Ms. Merritt introduced Mr. Jeffery Utermohle, from the County’s Office of Law, who will be working with the Commission.

Mr. Parts moved to adjourn the meeting, which passed with affirmative voice votes being cast Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Ms. Jefferson, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundryoff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 PM.

JCB:jcb