

Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission
October 13th, 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. Ed Hord, Vice-Chair
Mr. John Holman, Chair
Mr. Scott Holupka
Mr. Vincent Johnson
Mr. Christopher Weston
Ms. Lili Mundroff
Mr. Raymond Scott
Mr. Christopher Parts
Ms. Wendy McIver

Not Present

Ms. Marina Novaes
Ms. Selisa Jefferson

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 October 6th, 2022.

2. Approval of the Minutes

Mr. Holman asked if anyone proposed changes to the September 8th, 2022 Minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Holman asked for a motion to approve the Minutes as written. Mr. Weston 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, Mr. Hord, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Scott, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

Mr. Parts entered the meeting at 6:07 PM.

Ms. McIver entered the meeting at 6:09 PM.

3. Consent Agenda

Ms. Brannock read the Action Recommendations for Consent Agenda Items 4, 7, 9, and 10.

Mr. Holman asked if anyone wished to discuss the Consent Agenda Items further. Hearing none, Mr. Holman asked for a motion for the Consent Agenda Items 4, 7, 9 and 10. Mr. Hord moved to approve the Consent Agenda items, as proposed, and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for Agenda Items 4, 7, 9, and 10. Ms. Mundroff seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Scott, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

Items for Discussion and Vote

- **4.** “Rocksmith Property”, 317 W Seminary Ave, Lutherville; Non-contributing structure in the Lutherville County Historic District; In-kind asphalt roof replacement [County Council District #3].

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

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Roofs: pages 1-13; County Code Secs. 32-7-405

- 5.** “Karras Property”, 504 Sudbrook Lane, Sudbrook Park; Contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District and Sudbrook Park National Register Historic District; Front door and window replacements [County Council District #2].

Ms. Brannock introduced the Agenda Item, which involved the replacement of all twenty-two (22) windows on the first, second, and attic-stories of the home, as well as the replacement of the existing front entry door. The proposal included three Work Items.

Ms. Brannock introduced the first Work Item, for the first and second-story window replacements and shared that existing first and second-story vinyl windows were installed around 1970. The owner wished to replace ten (10) existing vinyl windows on the first story, and eight (8) windows on the second story with new Marvin 4-over-one, Simulated divided lite (SDL), wood windows with exterior aluminum cladding. The applicant noted that all the existing window frames were the same size, (except the 2 smaller windows on the right side elevation), however, the windows on the first floor were 1-2” smaller than those on the second-story. All the proposed replacement windows were proposed to be the same size and would fit into the existing frames.

The applicant referenced several neighboring homes in Sudbrook Park that had original divided lites, and noted that the addition of the lites would be more in keeping with the original windows of the home. The original window style was unknown.

Ms. Brannock introduced the second Work Item, which was for the attic story window replacements. The applicant wished to replace the casement windows in the attic story, including the 2 gable end windows, and two in the shed dormer on the right roof slope. The application noted that the existing windows appeared to be original to the home, as they are simple wood hinged frames.

From a photo that Staff provided from their files, a 4-lite casement could be seen in the front gable-end in 2010. From the photos that the applicant provided, it appeared that the glass may have been replaced. Staff noticed, what appeared to be wood filler where the muntins may have been removed. There were no existing screens in the windows, the windows were actively leaking, and lead paint was detected. The owner wished to replace the windows with 4-lite, SDL casement windows. However, the

owner was willing to have the lead paint removed from the windows, the windows re-glazed, and repair the rotten wood framing if necessary.

Ms. Brannock introduced the third Work Item, to replace the existing front entry and security doors with an Upstate Door 90" x 36" wood door containing three-lights over two vertical panels, without the dentil shelf. The applicant noted that the condition of the existing door was fine, however, the applicant felt that the proposed replacement would be more in keeping with the original home.

Ms. Brannock shared that Staff found no issue in the removal of the security door as it was not compatible with the house. The existing front door appeared to be an earlier replacement from the 1930s or 1940s. The colonial style did fit into the vernacular style of the house, and Staff did not necessarily see the need to replace it if it's in good condition. The proposed replacement door style was more of a craftsman/bungalow style – with two vertical panels and lites in the top quarter (¼) of the door, which did not fit with the vernacular style of the house.

Our design guidelines state that existing or original doors are to be repaired, and if deteriorated beyond repair, then the replacement must be in-kind; where a historic/original door has been previously replaced with a historically inappropriate door, it should be replaced with a more appropriate door style. Ms. Brannock explained that Staff felt the replacement door style did not adhere to the design guidelines, and did not recommend approval of that style. She added that Staff could assist the homeowner in selecting a more appropriate door style for the house and the historic district, if the replacement was approved.

Ms. Brannock noted that the "Sudbrook Park Landmarks Committee" reviewed the proposal and was in support of the project as proposed.

Ms. Merritt introduced the property owner, Ms. Deana Karras. Ms. Karras asked for guidance on the selection of an appropriate door style, and reiterated that she would like to replace the existing door as is. Ms. Karras asked for clarity on Staff's recommendations for the replacement of the third-story attic windows. Ms. Merritt confirmed that Staff recommended the replacement of all windows including the third-story attic windows, and was happy to share materials and suggestions on a door style that was more in keeping with the vernacular style of the home and the historic district. Ms. Karras asked if she needed to return to the LPC for final approval of the door style. Mr. Holman responded that the Commission would delegate approval to Preservation Services Staff for the final door style selection.

Ms. Evans Letocha addressed Ms. Karras and asked if the condition of the front door necessitated replacement. Ms. Karras replied that the condition of the door was fine, and that her desire to replace it was based on aesthetic preferences.

Ms. Evans Letocha moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for Work Items #1 and #2 as proposed, and for Work Item #3 with the condition that Staff review and approve the updated door design selection. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hord, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Scott, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Windows and Doors: pages 1-8; County Code Secs. 32-7-405.

6. Kulyk Property, 9301 Old Harford Road, Parkville; Final Landmarks List #244 - CUB HILL HOUSE; Expansion of existing side addition [County Council District #3].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved the expansion of a portion of an existing 1-story, board and batten, 1970s kitchen addition, located on the southeast corner. The proposal originally came before the Commission at the April 14, 2022 meeting of the LPC and the LPC voted to not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or Notice to Proceed for the April 2022 proposal, as they felt the design did not meet the design guidelines and asked for better drawings, more photos, and an improved site plan to help them orient themselves with the property and structure. The Commission and Staff provided the following comments and recommendations at that meeting:

- Dropping the roof height slightly and setting the building line back from the historic stone block of the house;
- Aligning windows;
- Reducing the number of windows;
- A Labeled site plan that shows all structures, property lines, streets, neighboring houses, location of proposed addition, location of driveways;
- Photographs that clearly show the entire structure;
- Clearly labeled elevation drawings and plans that show existing a proposed conditions – that show the entire structure.

The applicant has now returned to the Commission with revised plans and additional photos that address the Commission's and Staffs comments from April 2022.

The proposal extends the footprint of the existing addition, and adds a 2nd story. The addition is proposed to consist of a mudroom and staircase on the first floor and storage on the second. It was proposed to be clad with 3/4" PT plywood, with 1x1 strips to create a board and batten pattern to match the existing irregular pattern on the first and second stories. The proposed windows were 6-over-6 double hung, Pella, black aluminum clad divided light. The window style would match the others on this addition. Additionally, the applicant wished to add a salvaged schoolhouse bell on the black standing seam metal roof. The existing entry door was proposed to be reused.

The overall roof height had been dropped by 8" and was setback from the building line of the historic stone portion. The drop could be seen in the proposed south elevation drawings, but not the north and east elevations. It appeared that the drop was only on the rear and not the front. The number of windows had been reduced on the east elevation from 2 on each floor to 1 on each floor.

The north elevation window was moved to the first floor and aligned with the other windows on the existing structure. The irregular board and batten spacing would be matched on the proposed addition.

Ms. Brannock noted that the way the structure is oriented on the property, the location of the addition on the southeast corner is facing away from Old Harford Road. The most visible portion of the house is the northwest corner. Given the proposed addition's location and heavy tree cover, depending on the time of year, the addition will not be very visible from the public right of way.

Staff was accepting of the general location of the addition, as it is an expansion of an existing addition. Staff noted that while the irregular patterned board and batten was not typical, the pattern is following what already exists.

Mr. Hord asked if the property owner was present. Ms. Merritt responded that the owner, Mr. Kulyk was not. Mr. Hord reminded the Commission that this property has been discussed before, and that the proposal had returned with some changes, and asked the Commission for their questions or comments.

Ms. Mundroff stated that she noticed the drop of eight inches marked on the drawings, but that because the height was so minimal, it was difficult to see, and that while the addition builds off of the existing, the combined size was beginning to compete with the stone façade of the primary historical structure. She added that eight inches may not be enough to reduce the roof height and drop from the existing ridgeline. Ms. Mundroff concluded her comments and added that the proposed cupula competes with the height of the existing brick chimney, and asked if a consideration may be made to further reduce the roof height and remove the cupula.

Ms. McIver advised that the proposed “cupula” was a salvaged schoolhouse bell.

Mr. Holupka noted that from Google Earth imagery, the addition would not be readily visible from the public right-of-way along Old Harford Road, and that vegetation along the front and side yards covered the majority of the house.

Mr. Parts reiterated Ms. Mundroff’s comments that the request to drop the roof height of the proposed addition was to distinguish it from the historic structure, and added that if the roof were to be lowered further, that the interior space would be inhabitable. He noted that this change may not be significant to distinguish the front façade from the addition as the roof drop will only be visible from the rear elevation.

Mr. Holupka moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or Notice to Proceed for the expansion of the existing side addition as proposed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Parts, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Holman. Mr. Weston abstained from voting. There were no dissenting votes.

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

- **7.** “Altbach Property”, 1018 Windsor Road, Sudbrook Park; Sudbrook Park County Historic District and Sudbrook Park National Register Historic District; In-kind front porch repairs [County Council District #2].

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

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Porches and Steps: pages 1-6. County Code Sec. 32-7-405

- 8.** Francis Property, 510 Sudbrook Lane, Sudbrook Park; Contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District and Sudbrook Park National Register Historic District; Construction of a new deck with garage underneath [County Council District #2].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved the removal of an existing, 12' x 18' ground level deck and the construction of a new, 20' x 30' deck elevated 8' above ground, with the underneath portion of the deck to be used for parking. The deck was to be located off the rear of the home, which sat on an approximately 1.2 acre lot.

This proposal was previously submitted to the LPC and was reviewed at the February 10th, 2022 meeting. The Commission voted to not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposal at that meeting, as the design did not meet the County Design guidelines. The Commission recommended that the applicant revisit the proposal and offered the following suggestions:

- Take cues and details from the main home and existing porch, rather than the existing deck, and to tie in components of that to make the garage/elevated deck less visually striking;
- Review the Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines;
- Look at other homes in Sudbrook Park to see how the proposal could be improved to better fit within the district and its character.

In addition, the Commission felt that the February submission had insufficient information, and asked that the application provide the following items when the proposal returned:

1. A complete site plan – to show existing and proposed property conditions, including all driveways, walkways, structures, property lines, streets;
2. Complete elevation drawings that fully show the proposal and its relationship to the main house; and
3. Additional information on how the proposal is consistent with the district.

A simple site plan was included as well as engineering plans that showed partial elevations, and photo simulated renderings. The current proposal was identical to the previous submission in size and location, however from the submitted renderings, the proposed siding color, and material had been updated to match the existing color of the main house - using shingles instead of lattice.

Staff noted some inconsistencies between the Engineering Drawings, the simulated renderings, and materials list submitted.

The details from the Engineering Drawings included:

- The deck structure would be constructed of pressure-treated pine, adjustable steel jack posts, and P.T. Glu-Lam Beams with concrete footings.
- Asphalt would be laid at the base to support vehicle storage.
- The sides would be sheathed with plywood covered with lattice on three sides, and three entry doors would be placed on the front façade.
- The proposed height of the deck was 8', with an additional 3' deck railing, for a total height of 11'.
- The deck floor would be covered with composite decking board material.

The applicant did not provide a clear narrative description of the proposed work that outlined the correct exterior material information. The list provided and the information on the simulated photo renderings were not consistent. Staff asked the Commission to clarify the exterior materials that the

applicant was proposing, and requested that the materials were updated on the plans to reflect what was to be built.

Ms. Brannock noted that the Sudbrook Park Landmarks Committee (SPLC) had reviewed the proposal and raised several concerns on the structure's size and compatibility with the neighborhood and historic home, but some of these concerns were addressed via email and they unanimously voted to support the project.

Overall, Staff was accepting of the general location and appreciated that it was not directly connected to the house. The exterior material change from lattice to shingles was a great improvement, however, Staff still had concerns over the size and felt that addition elevation drawings and details were needed, as a garage or deck of this size was not typical in Sudbrook Park.

Since the structure is in close proximity to the house, elevation drawings should show the proposed structure and its relationship to the existing house. Staff would like to see a rendering of the proposed structure as seen from the front or the street. Ms. Brannock noted that the photo simulations make it seem like the structure will be visible through the side porch.

In addition, Staff had concerns over potential runoff from the interior asphalt floor; since it had a deck flooring, water will trickle down to the interior. The potential runoff could impact the main house's foundation and cause water issues to the sides of the structure itself.

The LPC in the past has been less stringent in its review of decks because they are considered to be reversible, as stated in our Design Guidelines, (Fences and Landscape: page 4). Decks are generally open and simple structures, however this is a more substantial structure and feels more permanent than a typical deck. It is closed off, and will have an asphalt floor, and should be viewed as an accessory structure rather than a deck.

Ms. Merritt introduced the property owner, Mr. Francis. Mr. Francis stated that he believed he had submitted the materials previously requested by the LPC, and was willing to provide information as necessary. He also reiterated that the Sudbrook Park Landmarks Committee (SPLC) unanimously voted to support the project.

Mr. Hord asked for clarity on the deck flooring—if it would be wood decking with gaps between the boards that allow water to enter the interior of the garage space. Mr. Francis replied that the decking would be tongue and groove, the same as the existing material on the porch, and that it would not leak water into the interior. Mr. Hord reassured Mr. Francis that the proposed decking would drain water directly into the interior space. Mr. Francis responded that his intent for the garage space was not to have a waterproof interior, and that his primary concern was to protect the vehicles from the sun and heat.

Mr. Hord stated that the deck/garage rendering did not match the proposed dimensions provided in the plan, that the structure would not look like the rendering when constructed, and that it would be difficult to store the vehicles. Mr. Hord and Mr. Parts commented that the proposed 8' height of the structure would not provide enough space for vehicle storage.

Mr. Hord added that the proposed plans suggested that the structure would quickly deteriorate from water damage, and could damage the vehicles as well, as no waterproofing is provided within the

interior. Further, Mr. Hord raised concern that the rotting structure could become an eye-sore in the neighborhood within the next five years.

Mr. Weston noted that the structure would not comply with the Office of Zoning because it is an accessory structure that is not located behind the rear foundation line. He noted it would need to be reviewed by Zoning and secure a Variance before construction, where a full set of architectural drawings would be required.

Mr. Hord pointed out that the proposed materials were not shown on the plans apart from one photo-shopped rendering that showed cedar shingles at an angle, but it was unclear if that is the intended material. He added that it would be useful to see the proposed material type on elevation drawings and how it related to the existing home.

Mr. Weston raised concern that the proposed deck construction was an accessory structure that is trying to pass as a deck. Ms. Mundroff reiterated that the structure was clearly a garage as its intended use is to store vehicles. She added that the Design Guidelines for Additions and Infills would be used to assess the accessory structure's compatibility with the historic district. Ms. Mundroff also addressed that there was an existing garage located ~90 degrees from the proposed structure, and that it was important to understand the full property and relationship between the existing structures.

Ms. Mundroff moved to not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or Notice to Proceed for the construction of a new deck with garage underneath as proposed, and to contact the Office of Zoning before returning to the Commission. The motion was seconded by Ms. McIver, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Scott, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

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

- **9.** Obrecht Management Co. Property, 4832 Butler Road, Glyndon; Non-contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District; Commercial sign installation [County Council District #3].

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

Citing County Code Sec. 32-7-405.

- **10.** "Monologue LLC Property", 209 Central Avenue, Glyndon; Contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District MIHP # BA- 2210; Creation of 3 new window openings and removal/infill of existing replacement window on the rear elevation [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.** "Vestry of St. James' Episcopal Church Property", 3100 Monkton Road; Contributing structure in the My Lady's Manor National Register Historic District, Final Landmarks List #27 – Saint James Protestant Episcopal Church; Cedar shingle roof replacement [County Council District #2].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, to replace the existing cedar shingle roof with a new copper roof. St. James' Church was added to the final landmarks list in 1978. The brick church, constructed in a

Maryland vernacular interpretation of Georgian ecclesiastical architecture, was initially finished in 1755. Extensions were added in the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries. The proposed roof would consist of 15" hand-formed pans with approximately 1" high double locked random transverse seams. The applicant provided a photo shopped image of the church with an aged copper roof material in the application. The application noted that the half-round sacristy has always had a flat seam metal roof (photo 5). The applicant felt that the longevity of a copper roof would outlast a cedar shingles or composite cedar shingle. In addition, the applicant noted that copper standing seam roofs were used on buildings in the mid-18th century. Whilst this is true, it was more commonly seen on high style churches in large urban areas than on rural churches. Flat seamed metal roofs, were common on domes and rounds architectural elements in the 18th century. Copper roofing was imported from England during that time and it was not readily available in rural areas. Wood shingles were most likely the original material used on the church.

Department of Planning records show that the roof was replaced in 1840s, 1940s, 1970s, and early 2000s. The earliest photo found on file is from HABS documentation from the 1930s, which showed a wood shingle roof.

The replacement of the existing wood shingles with a copper standing seam roof, did not follow our Historic Preservation Design Guidelines. On page 8 of the Roofing chapter of our Design Guidelines, existing historic roofing materials must be retained and repaired; if the material cannot be repaired, it must be replaced in-kind. In-kind, means using the same material or choosing an alternative material where the appearance, texture, color, and other visual qualities are similar to the existing roof material. In addition, our guidelines state that the LPC may consider a different material if the original material is no longer available, the existing material is not original, or the roof is not visible from the street.

Regardless, any decision to use an alternative material, should be weighed against the primary concern of maintaining the building's historic and architectural character, as stated in the National Park's Services' Preservation Brief #4, Roofing for Historic Buildings. Roofs and its material type are character defining features on historic structures, and are often indicative of the architectural style and era that the structure was built. A material change greatly impacts the overall visual appearance, diminishing its historical and architectural integrity. This will be very noticeable, if the textured appearance of the wood shingle roof were to change to the bright, smooth, shiny, and vertical lines of a standing seam metal roof.

Ms. Brannock noted that while Staff understood the applicant's concerns of future roof maintenance, the current proposal did not meet our Historic Guidelines. An in-kind replacement using wood shingles or a composite or synthetic wood shingle would make the proposal consistent with our Historic Guidelines and would maintain the architectural integrity of the church.

Ms. Merritt introduced the applicant, Reverend Joseph Cochran. Rev. Cochran reiterated that the roof replacement was an issue of stewardship and long term maintenance, and believed that the copper roof would be in keeping with the time that the building was constructed, although a copper roof was never part of the building's history. Rev. Cochran explained that he understood this was a rural church, and cited the Christ Church in Philadelphia, PA as an example of a church constructed in the early-mid 18th century with a copper roof, and located in a large urban area. Rev. Cochran expressed his wish that the Commission consider the copper roof option so that the roof may last into the next century. The Reverend concluded his comments and shared that the price of a copper versus cedar shingle roof replacement was fairly close.

Mr. Holman asked if research had been conducted to determine if the church had had a copper roof in the past. Rev. Cochran replied that they were confident that the church never had a copper roof, and always had wood shingles, although a metal material was used on the roof of the sacristy, which is located on the rear of the church and is not visible from the road. The Reverend reiterated Staff comments that standing seam copper roofs were predominantly used in urban areas during the 18th century, and that there is no evidence of a previous standing seam roof on the building, apart from the sacristy.

Mr. Weston gave an example of a similar church, the St. Thomas Church, located on Garrison Forest Road, and noted that this church also has a wood shingle roof. He added that the wood shingles were important to the texture and visual appearance of the church, and asked if a structural engineer had assessed whether the building could support a slate roof. Rev. Cochran replied that the engineer reported that a slate roof cannot be supported.

Mr. Parts asked if a synthetic shingle roof could be supported, as it is typically a lighter weight than slate. Rev. Cochran replied that the synthetic alternative is 2.5x heavier than cedar shingles.

Mr. Parts asked if a copper shingle roof that has a similar texture to wood shingles, but the durability of copper had been considered. Rev. Cochran replied that that alternative had not been considered, but that it may exceed their price range. Mr. Parts stated that a copper shingle roof consisted of pre-fabricated, inter-locking shingles, and that while it may take more labor to install, the shingles would not necessarily comprise more material than a standing seam roof.

Mr. Hord stated that he felt the Commission should propose an alternative that is in keeping with the historic Design Guidelines and maintains the existing cedar shingle roof, although he sympathizes with concerns of longevity.

Reverend Cochran expressed concern with the lifespan of another wood shingle roof, paired with a diminishing parish that may not be able to fund another roof replacement in the coming decades.

Mr. Hord added that the suggested copper shingle roof would not produce a similar look or texture as the wood shingles, and that the copper may patina to a green color.

Mr. Holman thanked Rev. Cochran for his work and desire to preserve the church with an eye toward the future, and added that there was a balance between preserving historic structures to keep them standing, and maintaining a historic structure in a manner that was consistent with the history of the building. Mr. Holman concluded his comments by asking the Commission to discuss wood shingle alternatives, such as a composite or synthetic shingle that could offer greater durability and longevity than natural wood.

Mr. Weston advised that the visual appearance of the roof could be less in keeping with the intended texture and color if the wrong synthetic shingle is chosen, and may not resemble a natural material.

Ms. Evans Letocha asked if there was an immediate need for the roof replacement. Reverend Cochran replied that the roof was in very poor condition, and that the parish would like to receive approval for its replacement so that they could proceed as soon as possible.

Ms. Evans Letocha moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the in-kind replacement of the wood shingle roof in the same size, texture, and visual quality as the existing. The motion was seconded by Mr. Weston, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Scott, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Roofs: pages 1 -13; County Code Sec. 32-7-405.

12. O'Haro Property, 1603 S Rolling Road, Relay; Contributing structure in the Relay County Historic District MIHP# BA-2508; Part II Tax Credit Approval for Cellar door installation and rear patio/porch repairs & replacements to the roof and columns [County Council District #3]

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved the addition of two work items to a previously submitted Part 2 tax credit application that the LPC approved in 2021. The additional items included the installation of a cellar door and in-kind replacements to a rear porch/patio roof structure.

Ms. Brannock introduced the first Work Item, to install a steel Gordon hinged bulkhead door at the cellar opening on the rear kitchen addition.

Ms. Brannock introduced the second Work Item, for the removal of the existing roof structure and wood column on the rear patio. The rear patio metal roof and column was located off the rear, in the "ell" between the main house and the rear kitchen "ell" addition. The roof structure was deteriorated and falling down. There was only one remaining wood Doric fluted, column, and it was being supported by temporary supports. The roof was to be reconstructed using in-kind materials. The new roof would be covered with metal sheeting and supported by two new round, wood columns.

Ms. Brannock noted that no additional information about the condition of the remaining wood column was provided but that, from the photos, it looked repairable. The replacement columns proposed did not match the existing. There was no fluting, and the Doric capitol did not appear to have the dimensions of design.

Staff recommended conditional approval for Work Item #2 – that the existing column be retained and repaired, and that the new column match the existing.

Ms. Mundroff proposed that a motion be made to include a recommendation to replace the porch ceiling in kind.

Ms. Merritt introduced the property owner, Mr. O'Haro.

Mr. O'Haro explained that the rear porch would not be enclosed, and he was proposing to use plywood sheathing beneath the metal roof.

Mr. Holupka asked if the porch was added after the construction of the original historic structure. Mr. O'Haro replied that the porch was likely constructed off of the later rear kitchen addition, and was not a part of the original structure. He added that the existing porch roof contained a rolled metal roofing material that was installed during a make-shift repair by the previous owners.

Ms. Mundroff asked for additional information on the condition of the existing column. Mr. O'Haro replied that he was willing to repair the existing column if necessary. He added that the condition of the temporary columns was very poor.

Ms. Evans Letocha moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the installation of the cellar door, and conditional approval for Work Item #2, replacements to the roof and columns; that the existing column be retained and repaired, and that the new column match the existing. The motion was seconded by Ms. Ferguson, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Ms. McIver, Mr. Parts, Mr. Scott, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. One dissenting vote was cast by Ms. Mundroff.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Roofs: pages 1 -13; Windows and Doors: pages 1-8. County Code Sec. 32-7-405.

To be reported:

Ms. Merritt 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:

- Chakmakas Property, 7003 York Road (Stoneleigh National Register Historic District) HVAC system replacement.

Other Business

Mr. Johnson entered the meeting around 7:00pm.

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. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

The meeting adjourned at 7:16 PM.

JCB:jcb