

**Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission  
January 12<sup>th</sup>, 2023 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 6:06 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  
Ms. Wendy McIver  
Ms. Lili Mundroff  
Mr. Christopher Parts  
Mr. Raymond Scott  
Mr. Christopher Weston

Not Present

Ms. Selisa Jefferson

Attending County Staff included Ms. Caitlin Merritt (Preservation Services Chief), Ms. Jennifer Nugent (Division Chief, Development Review), Ms. Jessica Brannock (Preservation Planner), and Mr. Jeffery Utermohle (Office of Law)

**1. Selection of Chair and Vice-Chair**

Mr. Holman informed the Commission that the first order of business was the selection of a 2023 Commission Chair and Vice-Chair. Mr. Holman asked for any nomination motions.

Ms. Evans Letocha moved to nominate Mr. John Holman and Mr. Ed Hord to continue to serve as the Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively, for 2023. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative voice votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

Mr. Holman and Mr. Hord thanked the Commission for the opportunity to serve once again as Chair and Vice-Chair.

*Authority for Action – Baltimore County Code Article 3: Title 3: 1203: Officers*

**2. Review of the Agenda**

Ms. Brannock reported there were no changes to the Preliminary Agenda published January 5<sup>th</sup>, 2023.

**3. Approval of the Minutes**

Mr. Holman asked if anyone proposed changes to the November 10<sup>th</sup>, 2022 Minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Holman called for a motion to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Hord moved to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Weston seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative voice votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holman, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Scott. There were no dissenting votes.

**4. Consent Agenda**

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

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

**Items for Discussion and Vote**

- 5.** Prender Property, 207 Morris Ave, Lutherville; Contributing resource within the Lutherville County Historic District; Hardscape porch and patio construction on non-historic rear addition [County Council District #3].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved the construction of a bluestone patio on the rear (SW) elevation and south corner of the home, located on an addition constructed in 1994. Ms. Brannock informed the Commission that the area where the work will be located currently consists of crushed gravel with a timber retaining wall border on the southwest side; and a 1-story wood entry porch on the south corner. The yard will be graded as necessary for runoff control away from the house.

The wood flooring and wood stairs on the existing rear side entry porch will be removed and replaced with random pattern Pennsylvania bluestone floor. The new bluestone floor will extend beyond the existing footprint of the porch to create a larger patio that will have a retaining wall and a built-in area for a gas grill. The existing porch pillars will remain in place and support the existing roof.

An existing wood bridge walkway that connects the porch to the driveway walkway, and the existing timber retaining walls, will be removed to accommodate the new patio. In addition, the bluestone will also be laid along the span of the rear (southwest) foundation, replacing the existing gravel areas. This rear patio area (labeled as terrace on the plans) will be accessed by two dry-laid bluestone steps from the porch patio area. The rear patio/terrace will have two dry-laid bluestone steps that will provide access to the house/rear patio through existing French doors.

The existing 17' asphalt rear walkway that leads to the driveway/parking area, located on the south corner of the property, will be removed and replaced with PA bluestone to match the rest of the patio. A new side walkway of PA blue stone, is proposed to extend from the existing front walk around to the southeast elevation/side of the house and connect to the new patio with two bluestone steps.

Ms. Brannock concluded her summary by adding that the Lutherville Historic Advisory Committee submitted a letter in support of the property owner’s project, and that Staff found the project design to be compatible with the house, district, and consistent with our historic design guidelines. Staff recommended approval as proposed.

Mr. Parts joined the meeting around 6:23 pm.

Ms. Mundroff had a question about the plans, one showing that the two wood porch post remain, and the other not showing the posts. And asked if there was a way to leave the existing wood in place and then add to the existing material instead of removing it entirely. Ms. Mundroff felt that the present design would be reduced to a new roof above a stone terrace, and that the original porch form would be lost.

Ms. Merritt introduced the property owner, Mr. Wayne Prender. Mr. Prender clarified that the existing wood boards are not a part of the historic structure, and noted that the wood is currently failing.

Ms. Mundroff asked if the existing posts will remain during the patio construction. Mr. Prender responded that posts support the weight of the structure and will remain in place.

The Commission had no further questions or comments.

Mr. Weston moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the hardscape porch and patio construction as proposed. The motion was seconded by Ms. McIver, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, 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*

- \*\*6.** Markowitz Property, 118 Osborne Avenue, Old Catonsville; Contributing resource within the Old Catonsville National Register Historic District; Part II Tax Credit – Hot water boiler replacement [County Council District #1].

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

*Citing County Code Sec. 11-2-201*

- \*\*7.** Seese Property, 1605 Front Avenue, Lutherville; Non-contributing resource within the Lutherville County Historic District; Construction of a 15’ x 25’ Greenhouse installation in rear yard [County Council District #3].

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

*Citing County Code Sec. 11-2-201*

- 8.** “BURTON HOUSE”, Vanderbeek Property, 5116 S Rolling Road, Relay; Contributing structure within the Relay County Historic District; Part II Tax Credit - Removal of existing shingle siding and repair of original “German” siding on all elevations; prepping and painting window sashes [County Council District #1].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which entailed the removal of the existing cedar shake siding to reveal the original German siding on all elevations of the home. The German siding will be sanded, patched as needed with light carpentry, and finish work. Additionally, all window sashes will be prepped and painted with a single coat of oil paint primer, and a coat of finish color paint.

Ms. Brannock shared that Staff recommended approval with the following conditions:

1. Exterior wood repairs such as patching or Dutchman repairs must be done as per Standard #6, with in-kind replacements that match the existing, in material, dimensions, design, color, texture, and other visual qualities.
2. In prepping the exterior for painting, wooden features must be cleaned using the gentlest means possible, as per Standard #7. Gentle methods include using hand sanding and hand scraping for paint removal, and water based solutions with mild detergent and soft bristles brushed are recommended for historic wooden repairs. Power washing is not a recommended treatment and if utilized, it must be done with caution and at a low pressure so not to damage the wood. A primer must be applied on prepped surface with adequate time to dry before applying exterior paint.

The Commission had no further questions or comments.

Mr. Hord moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the exterior alterations with the conditions outlined by Staff. The motion was seconded by Mr. Parts, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Scott, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Façade Materials: pages 1-12; County Code Sec. 32-7-405; 11-2-201*

9. Lauchman Real Estate Corp and EK Homes, LLC Property, 501 Bond Avenue, Reisterstown; Final Landmarks List #105, PRICE HOUSE (FRESE HOUSE) 1). Ex-post facto review of various exterior alterations – Code Enforcement Correction Notice # CB1600086. 2). Return of various exterior features to the front façade [County Council District #2].

Ms. Brannock introduced the Agenda Item, which involved the ex-post facto review of various exterior alterations made to the Final Landmark. Ms. Brannock informed the Commission that a constituent inquiry was received in response to recent exterior renovations to the final landmark, and a correction notice was issued on November 22, 2022.

Ms. Brannock shared a general history of the landmark, and explained that The Price (Fresse) House was constructed in the late 19th century, in the Folk Victorian style, with various cross gables remnants of Downing and Vaux cottages. The house was added to the Final landmarks list in 1991 for its architecture and material integrity.

Ms. Brannock informed the Commission that the present owners purchased the property in April 2022 and made major renovations to the interior and exterior, subsequently putting the house on the market in November 2022. The application noted that the Final Landmark status was not disclosed to the current owners upon purchasing the home, and that they were unaware of the code requirements for exterior alterations for Landmarks.

Ms. Brannock noted that the previous owners were aware of the Landmark status, as the property received a Correction Notice in March 2016. Between April 2016 and October 2018, the previous owners were in contact with Staff in order correct work that was completed without LPC approval. Past work that was reviewed and approved by the LPC, included:

- the in-kind repair/replacement/painting of exterior siding/trim/porch;
- replacement of 2 existing replacement windows in the kitchen with true divided pane wood windows to match the original openings;
- securing the existing 1st floor window openings with plywood and/or existing shutters;
- securing existing 2nd and 3rd floor window openings as proposed;
- Maintain plywood over 1st floor windows;
- Maintain vinyl on second and third floor windows (vinyl was installed without approval and was denied, however in October 2018, the owner mentioned that she was planning on selling the house and asked that it be maintained)

Ms. Brannock added that no photos of the house from early 2022 were included with the application. LPC files from the previous code enforcement case, documents the house from March 2016 to January 2019.

The current owners are seeking an ex-post facto review of various exterior alterations, including the following work items:

**Work Item 1: Exterior Door replacements:**

The application noted that previous front entry, located on the south elevation was boarded at the time of purchase, and a new door was installed. In addition, a new side entry opening and door were installed on the north elevation to provide access to the existing rear porch. Staff as no issues with the replacement of the door on the rear that provides access to the rear porch as is located on the rear and is not visible from the public right of way.

From Staff's photos from 2016 and 2017, the original sidelights and transom are present and visible. Regardless, if the original door, transom and/or sidelights were present or not, the existing opening was expanded and a large modern style replacement door was installed. Our design guidelines state that *original exterior doors must be repaired and when repair is not feasible or the door is missing, it should be replaced in-kind with a door that replicates the original door, in size, material, profile, number of panels and other character defining features. When the door is missing, and no evidence exists, a replacement a door style should be consistent with the house's architectural style. In addition, Transoms, side and fanlights are important components of a historic door and must be replicated to match the original doorframe in design, materials, type of glass and pattern design.*

Staff indicated that both the opening's expanded size and replacement door are not compatible with the style of the house and do not meet our design guidelines.

Staff does not recommend approval for the expansion and replacement of the front entry as completed, and recommends that the front door replacement be removed, and a more compatible wood door, with side lights and transoms that match the photos from 2016 and 2017 be returned to the house.

**Work Item #2 - Windows:**

The application noted the following changes occurred:

- All existing windows were replaced with 1/1 vinyl sashes;
  - On the Northwest Elevation (closest to Bond Ave.)
    - 10 existing three-over-one windows were replaced with one-over-one vinyl windows. No information was provided about the previously existing windows material.
  - On the front:
    - The gable wing windows were adjusted to accommodate the 1st floor kitchen layout and infrastructure updates
    - Three of the existing windows including one, four-over-four center window on the second level, and two floor to ceiling windows on the first level were enclosed and covered with shingles;
    - Two arched windows were replaced
      - The arched window on the northwest elevation was removed to accommodate the HVAC unit located in the attic space
  - On the rear;
    - 4 windows were removed and enclosed and covered with shingles. Two center windows and 2 on the 2nd story of the rear gable wing.
    - Arched cross gable window replaced
  - On the South Elevation:
    - 3 existing openings were enclosed, including a door opening and covered with shingles
- The applicant noted that the majority of windows and shutters were previously removed and/or boarded with ply-wood at the time of purchase, however no detailed information about the style, material, or condition was provided in with their application

Ms. Brannock shared that originally, the house had 42 windows, two of which were previous replacements located on the north side, closest to Bond Ave, in the former kitchen. The previously existing windows included a mix of 2-over-2, 4 over-1 and 6-over-1 wood windows; and 3, 2-over-2 arched windows in the cross gables. There were 14 on the first floor, 16 on the 2nd, and 12 on the 3rd.

Ms. Brannock reminded the Commission that our design guidelines state that changing the location, covering-up, changing the dimensions of a window opening, or adding new windows is not appropriate, as it disturbs the structure's rhythm and undermines the historic integrity. The LPC does on occasion approve enclosing, enlarging or adding a window at the rear, or other portions of the house, that are not visible from the street, as long as the proposal respects the historic character of the house. In addition, our design guidelines state that historic wood windows must be retained and repaired. If they cannot be repaired they must be replaced in-kind, meaning replacements must match the original in size, sash and light configuration and other visual qualities. In addition, it states that vinyl or metal clad windows are not permitted a replacement material in historic dwellings.

The style, arrangement, size are all indicative to a house's architectural style and the period it was constructed. From looking at current photos of the house, Staff noticed that the replacement windows also appear to be smaller than the previously existing window openings. You can easily see the where the shingles were filled in. The front gable wing window replacements do not align vertically, and look out of place. The floor to ceiling porch windows are a hallmark characteristic of the Folk Victorian Style houses, their enclosure, diminishes the overall character of the house.

In addition, the replacement window sizes, style, and materials does not match what previously existed on the house, as per our design guidelines.

Staff understands that the only visible façade is the front from Bond Ave from the railroad side and that some of the windows on the rear and side elevations that were 6/6 may have been earlier replacements, the 2/2 were most likely to be original. Staff made the following recommendations for the front façade only:

- Not to approve the window enclosures and replacements on the front façade, as they do not follow our design guidelines;
- Remove all windows and open all window enclosures, and install wood, true divided light windows that match the previously existing windows style and dimensions;
- Gable wing windows need to be removed and replaced with a window that matches closely to what previously existed.
- Return the two arched windows in the cross gables on the 3rd floor

**Work Item #3- Front Porch:**

The application noted that at the time of purchase, the front porch had been dismantled and the stairs were removed. The current owners reconstructed the front porch roof, deck, railing, and stairs. The existing columns were retained and new lattice and lighting was installed.

Ms. Brannock noted that the location of the porch stairs have been moved. Although, not ideal, the location change does not distract or take away from the character of the porch. Staff recommended to issue a Notice to Proceed, as completed for the porch work.

**Work Item #4 - Pathways:**

The application also included work for new pathways, however, this is not part of the LPC's purview since the property does not have a setting.

---

Ms. Brannock continued that in addition to the ex-post facto review items, the applicant proposed additional work items to return some features back to the house, using photos from 2016-2019.

**Work Item #5- Decorative "sunburst" gable detail:**

The applicant wished to recreate the original decorative sunbursts on the front (southwest) elevation that were removed by the previous owners. The sunbursts will be custom made from pressure treated lumber trim pieces and will be installed just above attic HVAC ventilation as seen in the current 2022 images. The sunbursts will be slightly smaller than the original due to attic ventilation requirements. No dimensions or other design specs were included with the application.

While staff had no issues with this, however, they would like to see more detailed drawings and plans of the sunbursts. Staff noted that they had some photos of the original "sunbursts" that they would be happy to share. Again Staff feels that more information and details are needed to determine if they will be appropriate.

**Work Item #6 - Install vinyl Shingles:**

The applicant proposed to remove the previously installed lapped vinyl siding on the third story levels and replace with Foundry - 7 Inch Staggered Shake vinyl siding to mimic the existing original cedar shake shingles present on all other levels.

Ms. Brannock noted that the house is sheathed in shingles, as the surface appears to be smooth and does not have the rough surface texture as shakes.

No information was provided if the original wood shingles remained underneath.

Ms. Brannock shared Staff recommendations that if the original wood shingles are underneath, that they be repaired, rather than replaced with vinyl. Otherwise, staff recommended replacing the vinyl with wood shingles that match the texture, pattern and dimensions of the existing shingle siding.

**Work Item #7- “gingerbread” porch trim:**

The applicant proposed to replicate the “gingerbread” trim detail that previously existed on the porch cornice. The trim was to be custom milled to recreate the decorative pattern as close as possible to the original.

Staff recommended approval with the conditions that the original decorative brackets and dentil details also be returned to the porch cornice as well.

**Work Item #8- Faux Arched windows:**

The applicant proposed to replicate the two arched windows located on the third-level of the front elevation, by custom fabricating rounded trim installed above the existing one-over-one vinyl window. An obscured custom cut piece of glass from Hodges Window and Glass will be installed within the semi-circle of each window trim in order to mimic the original arched windows.

Ms. Brannock shared that while Staff appreciated the applicant’s attempt to return this feature to the house, Staff would like to see more detailed information about how this will be done in the existing space, with the addition of the “sunburst” detail. Staff is concerned that there isn’t enough space and it will be too crowded.

Ms. Merritt introduced one of the property owners, Mr. Travis Lauchman. Mr. Lauchman stated that he and his partner, Mr. Eugene Kogan were not aware of the property’s landmark status at the time of purchase, and added that the previous owner reached out to him and Mr. Kogan to purchase the property as a private sale. Mr. Lauchman noted that the sale was completed quickly, and that no information on the historic status was disclosed. He continued that the interior and exterior of the property was in poor condition.

Mr. Holman thanked Mr. Lauchman, and thanked Staff for providing a detailed summary of the alterations made to the property. He asked that the Commission consider the home and the work in its entirety, and to put aside any comments on the extenuating circumstance of whether the current owners were aware of the landmark status at the time of purchase, or not. Mr. Holman reminded the Commission to solely review the work, and what may be done to remediate it.

Mr. Weston stated that the house should be restored to the condition at which it was designated a Baltimore County Landmark.

Mr. Hord strongly recommended that an architect be consulted to provide elevation drawings of the proposed restorative work for a resubmission to the Commission, and noted that the Commission cannot review the completed work as submitted. They need to be able to see that its being done correctly.



Mr. Johnson reiterated that a professional architect with a background in historic restoration/rehabilitation be consulted.

Mr. Holman mentioned that Staff's comments centered on the front façade, and asked if the Commission is satisfied with the work conducted on all other elevations.

Mr. Hord responded that each elevation should be considered, and that the front façade, and any side visible on the street should be rehabilitated to its former historic state. Mr. Hord reiterated the significance of the landmark structure and stated that the completed work stripped the character defining features of the home. He noted that the removal and misalignment of the front façade windows showed an oversight in the design and planning of the alterations.

Mr. Parts commented that the rear elevation appears to be more organized than the front façade, and generally recognizes the original openings that were in place. Mr. Parts suggested that plans be resubmitted with the focus on the front façade, where the most egregious alterations were made.

Mr. Johnson asked if photos were available to the owners prior to purchase. Mr. Lauchman responded that he and his partner have some exterior and interior photos from 2019, which were provided by Staff. Mr. Lauchman added that electrical and plumbing permits were secured prior to updating the plumbing, electric, and HVAC systems.

Mr. Holman restated the Commission's requests that the owners return to the LPC with architectural drawings that include plans to restore the façade and elevations to the state at which the structure received landmark status.

Mr. Hord moved to not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or a Notice to Proceed for all alterations completed on the exterior of the structure, or for the work proposed to remediate the removal of character defining features, and asked that the owners return with architectural drawings with particular attention made to bring the front façade back to its historic state. The motion was seconded by Mr. Weston, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundryoff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Scott, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

Ms. Evans-Letocha asked that Staff share photos of the elevations from 2016 with the owners, and their prospective architect, and asked that the owners conduct research on historic images that may help in the restoration process.

Co-owner, Mr. Eugene Kogan addressed the Commission and stated that several windows were boarded at the time of purchase. He continued that ductwork was installed around the area of the front second-story level, and that it was necessary to move the existing window (this window is now misaligned with the first and third stories). Mr. Kogan continued that the previous arched-window on the third-story attic stretched to the floor, and would not adhere to County code. Mr. Kogan clarified that the new entry opening and door installation on the rear were made by the previous owner.

Mr. Hord advised the owners to discuss the window openings with their prospective architect, and reassured them that ductwork can be installed correctly to not interfere with window placement, and that historic windows can be secured to meet County code guidelines.

Ms. Evans-Letocha added that complete plan drawings will help the Commission understand the relationship of the windows to the interior of the structure.

Ms. Evans-Letocha asked if any work would be eligible for County Historic Tax Credits. Ms. Merritt responded that the work would not qualify under the Residential Tax Credit program because the home is not the primary residence of either owner, and that the cost of the work is not a large enough sum to be eligible under the Commercial Tax Credit program, as the project would need to be a substantial rehabilitation.

Mr. Holman thanked the owners for attending the meeting and encouraged them to reach out to Staff for guidance on how to proceed with the decision.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Windows and Doors, pages 1-8; Porches and Steps, pages 1-6; Façade Materials, pages 1-12. Baltimore County Code 32-7-403 & 32-7-405*

10. “The Union of Brothers and Sisters of Ford's Asbury, Inc.”, StyleMark Properties, LLC Property, 11646 Philadelphia Road, Perry Hall; Final Landmarks List #181, UNION OF BROTHERS AND SISTERS, LORELEY SCHOOL; Window Repairs; shutter replacement; returning 2 windows to the front [County Council District #5].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved window repairs, shutter replacements, and the return of two windows to the front façade of the Union of Brothers and Sisters, Loreley School. Ms. Brannock shared that the building is a vernacular frame structure, originally constructed in 1874, and served as a school, and as a lodge hall for the African American community of Loreley. It was placed on the final landmarks list in September 2000. The house was relocated 75 feet northeast from its original location (right on Philadelphia Road), to its current location sometime in late 2005 or 2006.

Ms. Brannock continued that the applicant proposed the following work items:

**Work Item #1: Window Repair:**

The applicant proposed to repair all 10, existing windows. The windows appear to be wood, 6-over-6, sashes. The repairs will include the following:

- replace glazing
- replace broken glass where needed
- interior and exterior trim will be repaired, scraped, and painted

Ms. Brannock asked the Commission to confirm the types of repairs that will be made to the trim and sills.

**Work Item #2: Shutter Replacement:**

All shutter sets (12) and associated hardware will be replaced in-kind. The application did not provide a lot of information about the existing shutters condition or its style. From the photos submitted, there appears to be 2 or 3 pairs of louvered shutters. The application stated that the new shutters will match the existing, however, no additional information about the design of the replacement shutters was provided.

**Work Item #3: Return of two windows to front façade:**

The applicant proposed to return 2 windows on the first floor of the front elevation, where two windows previously existed, as seen in an older photo. The application indicated that selective

demolition will be done to determine the exact location of the previously enclosed window frames and that they will be aligned with the windows on the 2<sup>nd</sup> story. Ms. Brannock noted that the submitted plans show a bathroom on the first floor that would prevent the windows to be vertically aligned. Ms. Brannock asked the Commission to clarify this.

Ms. Brannock concluded her summary and shared that the replacement windows will be wood, custom fabricated to match the window profiles, rails, and mullions of the existing windows.

Ms. Merritt introduced the contractor for StyleMark Properties, LLC, Mr. Dominic King. Mr. King explained that the first-story two windows were previously covered, and have since been uncovered within the interior, and that the existing framework was exposed. He continued that the exterior siding will only need to be removed to fully expose the two windows, and that new openings will not need to be created to return the existing windows to the front façade. Additionally, the existing window placement does not interfere with the interior bathroom. Mr. King added that a woodworker created the bit-profile for the wood windows and shutters, and that the shutter hinges were retained so that they may be operable. Mr. King concluded his comments and stated that the shutters will be fabricated to replicate the style, material, and visual aspects of the originals, and windows will be repaired in-kind as necessary.

Mr. Holman mentioned that the Union of Brothers and Sisters, Loreley School was included in one of Mr. Louis Diggs' books on Baltimore County history.

Mr. Johnson added that he had the opportunity to work with Mr. Diggs while he served on the Board of the Diggs-Johnson Museum, and that the style of building was similar to that of Rosenwald Schools, and is unique to this area.

Mr. Parts restated Mr. King's clarification that the bathroom does not interfere with the top and bottom window alignment.

The Commission had no further questions or comments.

Mr. Parts moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the window repairs; shutter replacement; and the return of two (2) windows to the front façade. The motion was seconded by Ms. Mundroff, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Mclver, 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 Sec. 32-7-405*

**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 2 tax credit application approval for work reviewed by Maryland Historic Trust:

- Wells Property, 305 Hopkins Road, Rogers Forge National Register Historic District, Tax Credit Part II-ER repairs to front asphalt roof [County Council District #5].

- Joice Property, 518 Murdock Road, Anneslie National Register Historic District, Part II approval for front porch beadboard ceiling replacement; front porch steps repointing; garage wood base replacements [County Council District #6].
- Watson Property, 7005 York Road, Stoneleigh National Register Historic District, Part II approval for HVAC installation [County Council District #5].
- Curran Property, 721 Cliveden Road, Sudbrook Park County Historic District and National Register Historic District; Part II approval for porch ceiling/second story framing repairs [County Council District #2].
- Wissel Property, 1201 Western Run Road, Western Run-Belfast Road National Register Historic District; Part II amendment for barn foundation mortar repointing [County Council District #3].

### **Other Business**

Ms. Merritt introduced the Baltimore County Public School's project team for its informational presentation about the future expansion and alterations to the landmarked high school. Ms. Merritt reiterated that the presentation is for informational purposes only, and that no formal review of the project will be taking place.

Ms. Merritt introduced Mr. Ran Ilkovitch, of Smolen EMR, Ilkovitch Architects to share its presentation. Mr. Ilkovitch presented the BCPS, Towson High School's "Preliminary Presentation of Proposed Scope to Landmark Preservation Commission," which included several selective demolition options. Mr. Ilkovitch reiterated several times that the final design will not look like these preliminary schemes. The Commission offered general comments about the preliminary options. There was a general consensus that a sensitive selective demolition would be acceptable as long as the school maintains its architectural significance and would still be able to meet the criteria for which it was originally landmarked for. Particularly the front façade and theater.

Mr. Holman thanked the BCPS team for their time and thoughtful presentation. The presentation concluded around 8:08 pm.

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

The meeting adjourned at 8:10 PM.

JCB:jcb