

Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission
November 9th, 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. Wendy McIver
Ms. Lili Mundroff
Mr. Christopher Weston

Not Present

Mr. Raymond Scott
Mr. Christopher Parts
Mr. Scott Holupka

Attending County staff included Ms. Caitlin Merritt (Preservation Services Chief), Ms. Jennifer Nugent (Division Chief, Development Review), and Ms. Jessica Brannock (Preservation Planner).

1. Review of the Agenda

Ms. Brannock reported that there were no changes made to the Preliminary Agenda published November 2nd, 2023.

2. Approval of the Minutes

Mr. Holman asked if anyone proposed changes to the October 12th, 2023 Minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Hord moved to approve the minutes as proposed, the motion was seconded by Mr. Johnson and passed with affirmative voice votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

3. Consent Agenda

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

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

Items for Discussion and Vote

- **4.** “Batz Property” 801 Francis Ave, Relay. Non-contributing resource within the Relay County Historic District. Solar panel installation on the rear roof slope [County Council District #1].

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

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

- 5.** Rutkowski Property, 903 Adana Road, Sudbrook Park. Contributing resource within the Sudbrook Park Expansion #2 Adana Road County Historic District. Part II approval for slate roof repairs and cleaning [County Council District #2].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved a Tax Credit Part II application for minor repairs to the existing slate roof. Ms. Brannock shared that overall, the roof is in good condition, with the exception of several damaged or missing tiles and raised nails. The following work will be completed:

- In-kind replacement of Twenty-five (25) natural slate shingles, ten (10) in the front and fifteen (15) on the rear;
- Wood will be removed from the slate; [Note to Commission: The application didn't mention what this “wood” is referring too. Please clarify underlayment strips. Will they be replaced in-kind?]
- Installation of a plastic cement roof ridge & vent pipe;
- Installation of chimney flashing;
- The roof will be cleaned and cleared of debris/growing vegetation. Debris will be swept/brushed. [Note to Commission - No mention what products will be used, if any.]

The Commission had no questions or comments.

Mr. Hord moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the slate roof repairs and cleaning with the following conditions:

1. That the replacement slate matches the existing is size, shape, thickness, texture, color, and other visual qualities;
2. Any wood underlayment must be replaced in-kind to match the existing underlayment;
3. The roof must be cleaned by the gentlest means, such as low pressure washing and scrubbing using soft bristles. Do not sandblast, power wash, or use other types of high-pressure washing techniques. Chemical cleaners or soaps should be compatible with slate. Please read the manufacturer's instructions. Harsh chemicals and high-powered washing can cause slate to break or degrade.

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

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Roofs: 1-13. County Code Sec. 11-2- 201; and 32-7- 405. National Park Services Preservation Brief #29 – The Repair, Replacement, and Maintenance of Historic Slate Roofs.

- **6.** “Peters Property”, 322 Morris Ave, Lutherville. Non-contributing resource in the Lutherville County Historic District. Asphalt shingle roof replacement [County Council District #3].

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

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

7. Kaplan Property, 107 Central Ave, Glyndon Contributing resource in the Glyndon County Historic District. Part II approval for a roof replacement on the main roof and 1-story rear addition [County Council District #4].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved a Tax Credit Part II application for a roof replacement on the main roof and 1-story rear addition. Ms. Brannock continued that the house was constructed in 1884, and currently has a double lock tin, standing seam metal roof that was installed sometime around the turn of the 20th century. The application noted that the metal roof was installed over the original roofing material, which was wood shingles. The applicant submitted historic photographs that confirmed the original material.

The present ~120-year-old metal roof has deteriorated beyond repair and has separated at the seams. The applicant cited rust, pitting, holes, and chipped paint throughout that have continued to worsen despite routine painting and maintenance. The LPC approved tax credits for the cleaning and painting of the standing seam metal roof at its June 13, 2013 meeting.

The applicant proposed to remove the existing roof layers and sheathing, and replace with a Certaineed Landmark Pro architectural shingle roof in the color “weathered-wood” to mimic the original wood roof color.

Ms. Brannock noted that the design guidelines state: “If historic roofing cannot be repaired it should be replaced in-kind.” The LPC may consider a replacement material other than in-kind, if:

- The original material is no longer available
- The existing material has failed and is likely to fail again
- The existing material is not original
- The roof is not visible from the street

Since the applicant has evidence that the metal roof is not original, the LPC may consider an alternative material if the appearance, texture, and color are similar to the original roofing material based on the photo documentation submitted. However, staff noted that the proposed architectural shingle failed to accurately replicate the visual qualities of wood shingle roofing. Ms. Brannock explained that the proposed architectural shingle texture and the size of each shingle would create a visual pattern that competes with the overall design and architectural features of the house.

Ms. Brannock continued that the current proposal does not meet the design guidelines, as it did not call for the in-kind replacement of the existing metal roofing, or propose to return the original wood shingle material back to the structure. Additionally, the proposed alternative material does not accurately replicate the appearance of wood shingles.

Staff recommended that the applicant consider the following:

- In-kind standing seam metal roof replacement;
- Replace with wood shingles
- Research additional alternative materials that better replicate the appearance of a wood shingle roof, such as a synthetic or composite wood shingle;
- Last case scenario would be to consider a 3-tab asphalt roof material because it is flat and has not dimension and doesn’t create depth/competing visual pattern

Ms. Brannock introduced the property owner, Ms. Judith Kaplan. Ms. Kaplan offered a correction to the Staff summary and noted that the roof on the rear addition was not part of the proposal. Ms. Kaplan explained that the proposed shingle roofing was chosen to resemble the wood of the original shingles, and to bring the house back to its original design. Ms. Kaplan cited the poor condition of the wood shingles on the rear pumphouse roof and noted that they show signs of deterioration after they were replaced ~20 years ago. Ms. Kaplan continued that the proposed roof replacement presented a significant financial cost, and that the architectural shingles were a more durable, cost-effective option for her.

Ms. Evans Letocha asked if Ms. Kaplan had considered an in-kind metal standing seam roof replacement that would be eligible for the County and State Tax Credit programs, and would help to off-set the cost of the project. Ms. Kaplan replied that in her research, she did not find a metal roof replacement that accurately replicated the existing roofing.

Mr. Hord reassured Ms. Kaplan that it is possible to fabricate a metal roof to match the profile of the historic standing seam metal roof, and noted that the existing 120-year-old roof demonstrates the durability of the material.

Mr. Hord moved to not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of the existing standing seam metal main house roof with architectural shingle roofing, and to consider a wood or metal replacement.

Ms. Mundroff added that the Commission should reject the Staff recommendation to allow a 3-tab asphalt shingle replacement, and added that this material is being phased out by roofers. Ms. Mundroff and Mr. Hord discussed the motion and agreed that metal roof caps can be fabricated on site to match the existing.

Mr. Holman asked the Commission for a second and clarified that a wood shingle or an in-kind metal roof replacement be considered. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion.

Ms. Evans Letocha asked when Glyndon was designated as a County Historic District. Ms. Merritt responded that Glyndon was designated in the late 80's or early 90's, as one of the first County Historic Districts, and that by this time, many properties already had vinyl siding and asphalt roofing. Ms. Evans Letocha and Ms. Merritt noted that the property at 107 Central Ave is one of several homes in Glyndon that maintained their historic metal roofing. Ms. Evans Letocha continued that the existing standing seam metal roof was present for a greater amount of time than the original wood shingle roof.

Ms. Kaplan asked if the Commission had a chance to review the condition photos of the existing roof. Ms. Evans Letocha replied that the Commission agreed that the existing metal roof needed to be replaced, and that an in-kind metal roof replacement would not be much more expensive than the proposed material when the Tax Credit programs are used. Mr. Hord added that with the Tax Credits, the cost of the metal roof is comparable to the cost of the proposed shingle roofing, and would have greater longevity.

Mr. Weston reiterated that the role of the Commission is to enforce the County Historic Design guidelines, and thanked Ms. Kaplan for her comments.

Ms. Brannock asked Mr. Hord to restate the motion for clarity.

Mr. Hord moved to not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of the existing standing seam metal main house roof with architectural shingle roofing. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

Mr. Holman thanked Ms. Kaplan for her thoughtful comments and added that Staff will be in touch with how to proceed.

Ms. Kaplan asked for clarity on the Commission's decision. Ms. Brannock responded that the Commission determined that the proposed architectural shingle roofing did not accurately replicate the visual qualities of wood shingle roofing, did not meet the design guidelines, and is not a Tax Credit eligible option. Ms. Brannock continued that the Commission recommended two options that meet the design guidelines and are eligible to receive Tax Credits at the County and State levels: make an in-kind standing seam metal roof replacement, or replace with wood shingles.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Roofs: page 13. County Code Sec. 11-2-201 and 32-7-405.

Other Business

Next meeting January 11th, 2024

Adjournment

Mr. Hord 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. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

The meeting adjourned at 6:44 PM.

JCB:jcb