

Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission
April 13th, 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 6:00 p.m. Through the meeting, the following Commission members were:

Present

Ms. Phoebe Evans Letocha
Ms. Jamie Ferguson
Mr. John Holman, Chair
Mr. Ed Hord , Vice-Chair
Mr. Vincent Johnson
Ms. Lili Mundroff
Mr. Raymond Scott
Mr. Christopher Parts
Mr. Christopher Weston

Not Present

Ms. Selisa Jefferson
Mr. Scott Holupka
Ms. Wendy McIver

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. Review of the Agenda

Ms. Brannock reported that there were no changes made to the Preliminary Agenda published June 1st, 2023.

2. Approval of the Minutes

Mr. Holman asked if anyone proposed changes to the May 11th, 2023 Minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Parts moved to approve the minutes as proposed, the motion was seconded by Mr. Hord and passed with affirmative voice votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

3. Consent Agenda

Ms. Brannock read the Action Recommendation for Consent Agenda Item 5.

Mr. Holman asked if anyone wished to discuss the Consent Agenda Items further. The Commission had no comments or questions. Mr. Parts moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Consent Agenda Items as proposed. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

Items for Discussion and Vote

4. Burton Property, 4609 Prospect Ave, Reisterstown, Non-contributing structure within the Glyndon County Historic District, New deck and staircase construction on rear-east elevation [County Council District #4].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved the construction of a new deck and staircase on the rear-east elevation. Ms. Brannock noted that the property at 4609 Prospect Ave is a non-contributing Cape Cod style dwelling within the Glyndon County Historic District, built in 1949. The neighboring properties on both sides are also other non-contributing resources.

The applicants wish to construct a 12' x 18' second-story deck and staircase that rises approximately 5' 8" above the sloped ground surface, on the rear-east elevation of the main house. The deck will be overlooking a hardscaped patio at grade. The deck will be supported by seven 6x6 posts with 18"x30" footers. A 4' wide wood staircase raising eleven steps high will be placed on the east edge of the deck construction and will be supported by two, 10"x12" footers. A series of 2'x8' floor joists will support the decking. The decking will be TREX Enhance Foggy Wharf; railings will be white vinyl with black round aluminum balusters, and it will be wrapped with white AZEK.

Staff would like to add that the previous owners received approval in May 2019 by the LPC for a deck proposal. The present deck proposal's design differs slightly from the 2019 approval, however it is in the same location and similar composite materials. Staff provided the 2019 application, technical committee report, and COA approval letter in the meeting materials packet for the LPC to review, Staff is accepting of the deck construction as proposed, as it is located on the rear-east elevation of the main home, and will not be visible from Prospect Ave, or the public right-of-way. In addition, the use of composite materials is acceptable as the structure is non-contributing.

Mr. Hord stated that he was satisfied with the design of the construction, and moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the deck and staircase construction as proposed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Parts, and passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Fences & Landscape: pages 1-5; Porches and Steps: pages 1-6. County Code Sec. 32-7-405.

- **5. Smith Property, 601 Cliveden Road, Pikesville, Non-Contributing resource within the Sudbrook Park County Historic District, In-kind asphalt roof replacements to main house and rear patio addition; in-kind gutter & downspout replacements; and front porch repairs and in-kind post replacements [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; Porches and Steps: pages 1-6. County Code Sec. 32-7-405.

6. "Porter House", Robinson-Brown Property, 19 Chatsworth Ave, Contributing resource within the Glyndon County Historic District Proposal, Part II Review for the recoating of the existing standing seam

metal main roof; and the replacement of the existing asphalt front porch and side roofs [County Council District #4].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved two work items: the recoating of the standing seam metal main roof, and the replacement of the existing asphalt front porch and side roofs.

Work Item 1: Main Roof Recoating

The main roof is covered in a coated standing seam tin roof. The existing coating is an asphalt-based silver aluminized coating, which is currently worn and the underlayment is visible. The owners are posing to recoat the existing roof. The work will include prepping the existing surface by cleaning with hot water washer, cleaning solution and high volume/low pressure to remove dirt, mildew and other surface grime. After the surfaces are prepped, a primer will be applied to all black spots and two coats of Sherwin Williams Metal Roof- coating will be rolled on the surface.

Work Item 2: Front Porch and Side Addition Roof Replacements

The existing front porch and 2-story side addition, roofs are covered with a 3-tab asphalt material. The proposal includes the removal of the two existing layers of roofing, replace any sheathing if needed, and install temperature ice and water shield. The owners have proposed the following two options for the replacement material:

- Option 1 - PermaLock aluminum shingles

The first option is to install Aluminum PermaLock Roofing in Slate finish in the “dawn” gray color. Staff notes that this is a newer material that hasn’t been seen in recent years in roofing proposals. Staff asks the Commission to discuss possible visual implications this material may or may not have. Staff would recommend that if this option is considered that the “smooth” finish be used instead of the “slate” finish proposed, as it adds a texture that the existing 3-tab does not have. In addition, the Commission should discuss color matching and take into consideration the main roof’s new coating and future fading when determining the appropriate color for the porch and side addition roof.

- Option 2 – Aluminum Standing Seam Roof

The second option is a 1.75" Rib Structural Aluminum Standing Seam Roof. The panels will be new 18" wide, with .032 SnapLoc, and 1.75" tall standing seams. The contractor’s estimate mentions the “rib” profile and some information in the application mentions the “smooth” profile. Staff notes that the smooth profile would be more appropriate. Our design guidelines allows the option for alternative roofing materials when the current material was previously replaced, however, any decision to use an alternative material should be weighed against the primary concern of maintaining the building’s historic character Staff would like the Commission to discuss the two material options and consider the following: location of replacements, its visibility, and color and texture and other possible visual characteristics.

In addition, Staff would like to point out that an in-kind replacement of the 3-tab asphalt material, in any color, meets our design guidelines as well, and still would be tax credit eligible. Staff is accepting of either material as long as the color, texture and other visible qualities are compatible with the roof on the main house.

Ms. Brannock introduced the property owner, Mr. Jamal Robinson. Mr. Robinson shared that he and his wife, Ms. Brown are very interested in maintaining the historic character of the home, and do not wish to make an in-kind asphalt roof replacement. He continued that he hoped to replace the main house

standing seam roof with whichever metal material is approved, at a later date, and restore the original wood windows next year (2024).

Mr. Weston suggested that repairs be made to the windows prior to the installation of the new porch roof, as the contractors may damage the roof while working on the windows, and that a standing seam metal roof would be easier to walk on than shingle.

Mr. Hord reiterated that a standing seam metal roof would be the better option, as it would maintain the texture and appearance of the existing roofs.

Ms. Mundroff noted that there are other homes on Chatsworth Ave in the Folk Victorian style with a an asphalt shingle front porch roof and a standing seam main center cross gable roof, or a replaced asphalted shingle main roof. Ms. Mundroff asked if there is information on the historic material of the front porch roof.

Mr. Robinson replied that the changes in roofing material appear to reflect economic decisions made in the past to replace standing seam on smaller porch/addition roofs with asphalt shingles, and cited a neighboring property that identified original standing seam beneath asphalt shingles on their front porch roof.

Mr. Hord moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the recoating of the existing standing seam metal main roof; and the replacement of the existing asphalt front porch and side roofs with the condition that an aluminum standing seam roof be installed in the "smooth" profile, in a custom color that matches that main roof. The motion was seconded by Mr. Parts, and passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Scott, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Roofs: pages 1-13; Porches and Steps: pages 1-6. County Code Sec. 32-7-405 and 11-2-201

Other Business

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

- King Property, 711 Cliveden Road, Pikesville; Contributing resource in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District; Part 2 Approval for in-kind roof replacement; cedar shake siding repairs/replacements; and cedar shake siding staining [County Council District #2].
- Knott Property, 517 Murdock Road, Towson; Contributing resource in the Anneslie National Register Historic District; Part 2 Approval for the installation of a Sila Heating & Air Conditioning – New High Velocity Air Conditioning System [County Council District #6].

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

The meeting adjourned at 6:27 PM

JCB:jcb