

**Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission
November 10th, 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. Christopher Weston
Ms. Lili Mundroff
Mr. Christopher Parts
Ms. Wendy McIver
Mr. Scott Holupka

Not Present

Ms. Selisa Jefferson
Mr. Vincent Johnson
Mr. Raymond Scott

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

1. Review of the Agenda

Ms. Brannock reported no changes to the Preliminary Agenda published November 3rd, 2022.

2. Approval of the Minutes

Mr. Holman asked if anyone proposed changes to the October 13th, 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 Ms. Ferguson. 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. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

3. Consent Agenda

Ms. Brannock read the Action Recommendations for Consent Agenda Items 4, 6, and 7.

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, 6, and 7. Mr. Hord moved to approve the Consent Agenda items, as proposed, and issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for Agenda Items 4, 6, and 7. 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. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

Items for Discussion and Vote

- **4.** Watkins Property, 709 Cliveden Road, Sudbrook Park; Contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District; Part II Tax Credit - Various exterior repairs and in-kind replacements to the slate roof; shutters; porch steps and handrail; fascia and gutters; and exterior painting [County Council District #2].

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.** “Leola (Viola)” McClung Property, 1604 S Rolling Road, Relay; Contributing Structure in the Relay County Historic District, MIHP # BA-2515; Ex-post facto review of front yard fencing installation [County Council District #1].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved the ex-post facto review of a wood picket fence extension along the north property line in the front yard. Ms. Brannock informed the Commission that a neighbor contacted staff about the fence in October 2022, and staff reached out to the property owner to inquire about the work, and to determine if involving code enforcement was necessary. A correction notice was not issued.

Ms. Brannock continued that the property has an existing wood picket fence that encloses a portion of the yard on the north side of the house. The applicant noted that the rear half of the property is heavily wooded and contains a creek, which makes the rear yard soggy and wet. The new fence extends from the existing fencing, along the north side property line, and from the front porch - towards the road where it meets an existing retaining wall, enclosing a portion of the front yard. The retaining wall is roughly the same height as the fencing. The fence material installed matches the existing wood pickets. It is 36" to 42" at the posts, and will be painted in the spring of 2023.

Ms. Brannock thanked the property owner for providing additional photographs of the property for context. She shared that fencing that encloses the front yard is not typical in County Historic Districts, as noted on page 3 of our guidelines, and rarely approved, unless it previously existed. However, front yard picket fencing exist on other homes in the Historic district. In addition, the existing retaining wall may have had some sort of fencing on top of it, as several holes can be seen. Staff also noted that the top of the retaining wall is at the same level/grade as S. Rolling Road, and that the front yard sits below the wall/ street level by several feet. Because of this grade change, the fencing is not very visible from the road.

Ms. Brannock introduced the property owner, Ms. Barbara McClung. Ms. McClung shared that she is a new resident of the Relay community and is deeply interested in maintaining the historic beauty of the home, and thanked the Commission for volunteering their time and for their commitment to preservation.

Mr. Hord stated that he sees no issue in the fencing installation as completed.

The Commission had no further comments or questions.

Mr. Hord moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the front yard fencing installation, as completed. 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. 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

- **6.** Seidel Property, 311 Register Ave, Rodgers Forge; Contributing structure in the Rogers Forge National Register Historic District; Part II Tax Credit - Original Hardwood floor refinishing, and electrical panel upgrade [County Council District #5].

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

Citing National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, Preservation Brief # 18 - Rehabilitating Interiors in Historic Buildings: Identifying and Preserving Character-Defining Elements; County Code Sec. 11-2-201

- **7.** Locke Property, 722 Howard Road, Sudbrook Park, Contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District; Split rail fence installation around rear garden [County Council District #2].

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

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

- 8.** Scott Property, 315 Central Ave, Glyndon; Contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District; Part II Tax Credit - Exterior Chimney repair; Chimney liner installation; wood insert installation [County Council District #4].

Ms. Brannock introduced the Agenda Item, which involved the Part II review of exterior chimney repair, liner installation, and a wood insert installation.

The existing chimney is unlined and has no crown cap, which allowed for water and pest penetration. The existing firebox is covered with glass doors. The chimney exterior and top will be weatherproofed. The crown will be repaired with screens installed on the sides, and the existing bricks and stone top will be retained and reset. The chimney will be lined with a new stainless steel ceramic insulated, liner. Additionally, the owners wish to install a new black, Osburn 3500 wood insert with an oversized faceplate with insulation and a blower.

Ms. Brannock noted that the chimney weatherproofing, crown repair, and liner installation are both tax credit eligible projects, and that staff recommended approval. However, the installation of a wood stove insert, is viewed as a "renovation" project, versus a repair project, and is not eligible for the tax credit program. Since the work is on the interior, LPC approval is not needed for the insert installation, it is just not eligible for tax credits, and will be itemized out in the Part III application.

Ms. Brannock introduced the property owner, Mr. Scott. Mr. Scott thanked the Commission for their time.

The Commission had no further comments or questions.

Ms. Evans Letocha moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the exterior Chimney repairs and Chimney liner installation 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. Mclver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Roofs: pages 1-6; County Code Sec. 32-7-405; County Code Sec. 11-2-201

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

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved the ex post facto review of a 3,800 sq. ft. paved parking lot. Staff was contacted by community members, and subsequently a Correction Notice was issued in June 2022.

Ms. Brannock reminded the Commission that the property owner came before the Commission at its July 14, 2022 meeting, and the Commission voted NOT to approve the work as completed. The Commission stated concerns over the parking lots close proximity to the Carriage House and asked that proper landscape plans be submitted that provide more details.

Ms. Brannock reiterated that 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 previous lot and driveway could be seen in a Google Street view image.

The new lot contains eight (8) regular parking spaces, and two (2) handicap spaces will be painted and identified with signage. In addition, concrete or plastic curb stoppers will be installed at the head of each space.

The applicant has now returned with an updated landscape plan with an additional electrical lighting site plan. The new landscape plan showed proposed shrubs to be planted along the entranceway and northwest border of the parking lot. Ms. Brannock added that while the LPC does not have purview over general landscaping, such as planting trees or shrubs, staff felt that the landscaping will provide a nice buffer to help minimize the commercial feeling of the lot, which was a concern from some community members.

Ms. Brannock introduced the property owner, Dr. Johnson. Dr. Johnson thanked the Commission for their time and added that she believes the updated landscaping and lighting will be an asset to the appearance of the property.

Mr. Parts asked if the proposed lighting fixtures were set on a timer, or by motion detecting sensor, to reduce the impact of light pollution to the surrounding neighbors.

Mr. Udumukwu, the contractor, and co-property owner responded that the lighting will be set on a timer from 6 pm to 7 am. Mr. Udumukwu added that the property was formerly an assisted living facility, but did not provide lighting in the parking area.

Mr. Holman reiterated that the timer settings should be adjusted with consideration of the surrounding neighbors.

Ms. Evans Letocha stated that during the July 14, 2022 LPC meeting, concerns with the close proximity of the parking area to the Carriage House were addressed as the grading and stormwater could negatively impact the foundation. Ms. Evans Letocha asked if the grading permit had been reviewed, as the updated plans do not address stormwater runoff toward the Carriage House.

Dr. Johnson added that the parking area was intentionally graded to divert water away from the Carriage House.

Mr. Holman asked Dr. Johnson to confirm that the parking area gently slopes away from the Carriage House. Dr. Johnson confirmed that it does.

Ms. Evans Letocha asked if anything had changed since the July meeting.

Dr. Johnson stated that the parking lot is not completed, and that all work ceased when the Correction Notice was issued in June 2022.

Mr. Parts noted that the site plans show elevations dropping from the parking area to the street (Carysbrook Road), and that the photos showing wet ground conditions indicate that stormwater is draining from the center of the lot, and out to the street. Further, the plan indicated two topographic lines that drop away from the parking area and toward the street.

Mr. Weston expanded on Mr. Part's comments on light pollution, and added that the neighbors living across the street from the parking area would be negatively impacted if the lighting were to run throughout the night. Mr. Weston suggested that dark-sky compliant lighting be used in the lighting fixtures, as the light shines downward to a specific area.

Dr. Johnson replied that they will take the dark-sky lighting into consideration and will make every effort to ensure that the neighbors are comfortable, while assuring that the Assisted Living residents are safe at all hours. Dr. Johnson also suggested that motion-detected lighting be used.

Mr. Hord stated that motion-detected lighting would be the most cost and energy efficient option, and recommended that the lighting be dark-sky compliant, and set to a motion-detecting timer.

Ms. Mundroff asked if considerations were made to soften the buffer around the paved area of the parking lot and neighboring homes. Ms. Mundroff remarked that the plans show three feet of landscaping buffer around the parking lot entrance, and asked if the plantings are intended to visually buffer the asphalt lot, or both the lot and the parked vehicles. Ms. Mundroff reiterated comments from the July 2022 meeting where a permeable surface lot was discussed, and asked if a fully integrated landscape buffer was considered in the updated drawings.

Mr. Holman suggested that Mr. Phil Conte, one of the landscape architects could address Ms. Mundroff's question.

Mr. Conte introduced himself and explained the process behind his landscape design. He noted that his team researched County requirements for paved parking areas and created an initial design that would

best apply to County standards. Mr. Conte directed the Commission to the landscape manual conditions plan showing the previous conditions of the parking area. He continued that if the parking area is adjacent to a public right-of-way, or a residential area, than a landscape buffer must be implemented. Mr. Conte stated that evergreen shrubs are proposed to buffer these areas, and that the proposed design was intended to meet the County requirements while being price-conscious toward the client.

Mr. Hord asked if the plan was designed to meet the minimum requirements/regulations, and if the potential negative impact to the surrounding neighbors was considered.

Dr. Johnson replied that she worked closely with the landscaping design team, and that multiple site visits were conducted to ensure that the neighbor's concerns would be addressed and mitigated in the new landscaping plan.

Mr. Conte added that while site and landscape design plans are typically coordinated, the parking area was already complete when his team was brought on. He reiterated that every effort was made to meet County regulations and reduce potential negative impact to the neighborhood.

Mr. Hord asked if the parking lot was graded toward the street. Mr. Conte confirmed that it does, and offered to resend the topographic plan to the Commission, that show that the existing contours slope away from the Carriage House and toward the street.

Ms. Brannock introduced Ms. Denise Watkins, the Landmarks Committee Chair of the Sudbrook Park Landmarks Committee (SPLC). Ms. Watkins shared that the SPLC submitted a letter to the Commission in preparation of the July 2022 LPC meeting that addressed many of the concerns raised tonight. She continued that neither the SPLC, nor the adjacent neighbors were consulted during the design process of the parking area. Ms. Watkins stated that she appreciates that the owners have made a good-faith effort to provide landscaping, and have taken a step toward mitigating the concerns made by the neighbors. Ms. Watkins asked if the adjacent neighbors were made aware of the new landscape design plans, and restated that the SPLC has not been contacted. She raised concern with the amount of landscape plantings proposed, and that it may not be enough to shield the parking area from the adjacent neighbor's view, as well as the public right-of-way. Ms. Watkins asked for additional information on the proposed lighting including light levels that will be cast by the lighting fixtures. Ms. Watkins concluded her comments and thanked the owners for the effort that they have put into the property, and noted that it is a great improvement.

Mr. Holman asked if the Commission is permitted to comment on lighting. Ms. Brannock replied that the installation of lighting fixtures is considered to be an alteration to the property, and will impact the historic view shed of the neighborhood.

Ms. Mundroff noted that the proposed lighting would be set on 12 ft mountings, and asked if the height was appropriate for a residential area. Dr. Johnson replied that she is willing to make any adjustments to the height or brightness of the lighting.

Mr. Hord stated that the 12 ft lighting fixtures are an appropriate height, but that the lighting must be cut off fixtures that do not aim light beyond the property line, or toward the neighbors. Mr. Parts confirmed that the photometrics described in the electrical plan indicate that the lighting will be significantly diminished at the street.

Ms. Evans Letocha asked if there is existing street lighting within the Sudbrook Park neighborhood. Mr. Holman suggested that that concern be addressed when the SPLC meet with the property owners.

Mr. Hord moved to issue a Notice to Proceed for the paved commercial parking lot as completed, with the condition that the lighting fixtures be cut-off lighting, dark-sky compliant, and are activated by motion sensors, and that updated materials be approved by the Sudbrook Park Landmarks Committee. 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. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Fences & Landscapes. County Code Sec. 32-7-405; 32-7-403

- 10.** Brennan Property, 102 Rosewood Ave, Catonsville; Contributing structure in the Old Catonsville National Register Historic District; Part II Tax Credit - Cedar shake siding repairs; exterior wood trim painting; concrete slab replacement; and concrete flooring installation in shed [County Council District #2].

Ms. Brannock introduced the Agenda Item, which involves a series of regular maintenance repairs to the exterior of the home including cleaning and staining a portion of the existing cedar shake shingle siding, painting wood trim/features, and removing/replacing concrete slabs located in the yard, and shed interior. All work items are eligible for the tax credit program except the replacement and expansion of the concrete slab/patio under the deck.

Ms. Brannock introduced the property owner, Mr. Brennan. Mr. Brennan reiterated Staff's summary that the Work Items aim to maintain the house as it exists with re-staining and painting, replacing the crumbling concrete slab at the rear, and noted that the replacement would reduce water damage to the rear house foundation.

The Commission had no further comments or questions.

Mr. Hord moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the following cedar shake siding repairs; exterior wood trim painting; and concrete flooring installation in shed 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, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. Ms. Mundroff recused herself from voting. There were no dissenting votes.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Façade Materials: pages 1-12; County Code Sec. 11-2-201

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:

- Watkins Property, 709 Cliveden Road, Sudbrook Park County Historic District, ER structural and roof repairs/replacements to the rear porch.

- Roche Property, 24 Wyndcrest Avenue, Catonsville, Old Catonsville National Register Historic District, Updated Part 2 amendment for 2021 exterior painting.

Other Business

Ms. Brannock shared that the Commissioner Training Workshop will be held virtually on December 8th, 2022 at 6 pm.

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

The meeting adjourned at 7:03 PM.

JCB:jcb