

Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission
March 14th, 2024 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 6:03 p.m. Through the meeting, the following Commission members were:

Present

Not Present

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

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 there were no changes to the Preliminary Agenda published March 7th, 2024.

2. Approval of the Minutes

Mr. Holman asked if anyone proposed changes to the February 8th, 2024 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. Parts seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative voice votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Liebel, 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 Item 4, 5, 6, and 8.

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

Mr. Parts left the meeting following the approval of the Consent Agenda.

Items for Discussion and Vote

- **4.** “Coale- Rider Springhouse,” Coale Property, 1317 Boyce Avenue, Ruxton. Final Landmarks List #245. COALE- RIDER SPRINGHOUSE (YOUNG MAN'S ADVENTURE). Part II approval for in-kind cedar shake springhouse roof replacement [County Council District #2].

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

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

- **5.** “Heritage Society of Essex and Middle River”, Baltimore County MD Property, 516 Eastern Boulevard, Essex. Final Landmarks List # 130. HERITAGE SOCIETY OF ESSEX AND MIDDLE RIVER. In-kind awning, wrought-iron stair railing, and wall sconce arm replacements; front entry repainting [County Council District #7].

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

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Porches and Steps: 1-6, and Façade Materials: 1-12. County Code Sec. 32-7-405.

- **6.** “Wagner Property”, 312 Central Avenue, Glyndon. Contributing resource within the Glyndon County Historic District. Part II approval for in-kind asphalt main house and garage roof replacements [County Council District #4].

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

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Roofs: 1-13. County Code Sec. 32-7-405. County Code Sec. 11-2- 201.

- 7.** “Costa Property”, 16223 Corbett Village Lane, Monkton. Contributing resource within the Corbett County Historic District. Ex-post facto review of 2-story Accessory Structure Code Enforcement Correction # CB2300746 [County Council District #3].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved the ex-post facto review of a 2-story Accessory Structure - Code Enforcement Correction # CB2300746. Ms. Brannock shared that the property at 16223 Corbett Village Lane is a 2-story gable roofed frame house, constructed in 1890, in the vernacular style. She continued that Historic Preservation Staff was contacted on November 23, 2023, and was informed of the construction of a 2-story garage on the property without LPC review and without a Building Permit. Subsequently, a Stop Work order was issued by Code Enforcement on December 1, 2023, with instructions to contact our office.

The applicant submitted an ex-post facto review of the partially constructed 2-story accessory structure, measuring 26’ by 48’ and around 30’ tall. It will have a 4-car garage on the first level and office space, bathroom, and fitness area on the second level. It has a rectangular footprint, with a gable roof.

The structure is located in the rear side yard off the northeast corner of the primary dwelling, along the east property line.

Ms. Brannock informed the Commission that as of February 2024, the following work was completed:
- Footers and concrete slab poured

- Exterior and interior framing for the entire structure-floor joists and decking, roof rafters, interior walls
- Plumbing rough-ins
- Plywood exterior sheathing
- Tyvek wrap
- Waterproof covering on the roof
- Grading

The proposed exterior finishes include vertical Hardie Plank siding and trim with a standing seam “Medallion Lok” metal roof consisting of 18” flat panels.

On the west elevation lower level, there will be two sets of 16’ x 7’ steel, extended panel garage doors. Above the garage doors will be a pent awning. No mention of the size or material was shown on the plans. On the upper level, two sets (4) of 53 ½” x 77 ½” Anderson 100 Series picture windows with black exterior framing are proposed. These will be flanked by barn style sliding shutters at either side. There was no mention of the size and material of these shutters.

On the south elevation, which faces towards the main road, a 36” x 80” Masonite fiberglass door will be placed on the ground level as a rear entry. There are no openings proposed on the east elevation, which faces towards the east property lines.

Ms. Brannock noted that this structure has had some community concerns over its size, compatibility for the area, and visibility, and that public testimony will be held following the Staff summary.

Ms. Brannock continued that several images were provided by constituents showing that the structure is visible from the NCR trail in the fall, and winter months without leaves on the trees. Staff provided these images to the Commission in the meeting materials packet. Ms. Brannock added that the structure is not as visible directly from Corbett Village Lane. The topography to the area, the property at 16223 is elevated slightly higher than the rest of the area, and that the greatest visual impact would be to adjacent properties at 16213, 16215, and 16221.

Ms. Brannock added that there are several larger historic accessory structures present in the district’s boundaries, which can be used for appropriate styles for exterior features. Staff included these in the Commission’s meeting materials packet.

Ms. Brannock shared Staff recommends that the Commission determine if the proposed structure meets our design guidelines in regards to the size of the structure, proposed design, and material choices. Additionally, Ms. Brannock added that the proposed structure will also need to meet other County Zoning code requirements and go through the special exception or variance process, if needed.

Ms. Brannock concluded her comments and stated that prior to the meeting, two written testimonies in opposition of the accessory structure, and three testimonies written in support were circulated to the Commission. Additionally, five speakers had registered to address the Commission.

Ms. Merritt provided a summary of each submitted written testimony.

Ms. Brannock introduced Mr. Andrew Clemens, the former owner of 16223 Corbett Village Lane. Mr. Clemens shared that he has lived in Corbett Village for half of his life, and had initiated the process to designate Corbett as a County Historic District. Mr. Clemens expressed concern with the size of the structure and suggested that the owners remove the completed work and redesign the structure.

Ms. Brannock introduced Mr. Andrew Crosby, a resident of Corbett Village. Mr. Crosby stated that he does not believe the present structure fits in with the community, and noted that the purpose of the Commission's review is to maintain the integrity of the historic neighborhood. He continued that much of the neighborhood pushback may have been avoided if the necessary permits were secured before construction, and suggested that the project be entirely redesigned to meet the historic design guidelines.

Ms. Brannock introduced Ms. Kristiina Altman, a resident of Corbett Village, and neighbor of the property owners. The Altman property faces the Costa property. Ms. Altman stated that she believed the existing structure would be a small garage, and mirror the size of the previous accessory structure that was in place during the Clemens' residence. Ms. Altman continued that she was surprised by the size of the structure and noted that the project did not undergo review by the Landmarks Preservation Commission, or secure the necessary permits prior to construction. Ms. Altman stated that she believed the intended use of the structure will be a dwelling, as a bathroom will be constructed on the second-story of the four-car garage. Ms. Altman noted that accessory structures in Corbett Village are located in the rear yard, and are not highly visible from the road, and asked the Commission to consider the many ways that the structure does not meet the Historic Design Guidelines.

Ms. Brannock introduced Mr. Jeremy Altman, a resident of Corbett Village, and neighbor of the property owners. Mr. Altman reiterated Ms. Altman's concerns with the size and visibility of the structure, and again, asked that the Commission adhere to the Historic Design Guidelines.

Lastly, Ms. Brannock introduced Ms. Barbara MacFarlane, a resident of Corbett Village, and neighbor of the property owners. The MacFarlane property is located next-door, to the immediate west of the Costa property. Ms. MacFarlane reiterated concerns with the size, location, and visibility of the structure, and stated her belief that property value would decline if structures that do not compliment the design principles of the historic district are allowed to remain without first securing permits and LPC approval. Ms. MacFarlane concluded her comments and stated that the community has supported the construction of additions and accessory structures in the past, as those projects were developed in keeping with the Historic Design Guidelines.

Mr. Weston stated that given the pending review with zoning and opposing community input, he could not support the continued construction of the structure.

Mr. Johnson asked for clarity on whether or not the existing structure was in keeping with the Historic Design Guidelines in terms of its size, scale, massing, and location. Ms. Merritt responded that accessory structures should be subordinate to the primary dwelling, and that there are instances where site constraints prevent accessory structures from being placed in the rear yard, and suggested that the topography of the Costa property influenced the location of the structure, in the rear-side yard.

Ms. Mundroff replied that a case for a site constraint was not fully presented, and asked if a consideration of scale and location justified the design plan and location of the structure. Further, she asked whether the structure would be defined as an "accessory structure," or as a "garage," and noted that there were too many outstanding questions that prevented the Commission from conducting an adequate review.

Mr. Holman clarified Ms. Mundroff's comments and stated that the Commission is able to reject the current proposal and provide feedback on how the design could better meet the Historic Design Guidelines.

Mr. Hord stated that the size of the primary dwelling is considerably smaller than the present structure, and that the design is out of scale for the house, and the neighborhood. Mr. Hord reiterated that the plans should first be reviewed by Zoning.

Ms. McIver commented that she is very familiar with the Corbett Historic District, and echoed Mr. Clemens' concern with the precedent that would be set if the structure was allowed to remain, as constructed.

Ms. Evans Letocha addressed comments made during public testimony that mentioned a previous structure stood at the location of the present construction. Ms. Merritt replied that our office did not have any information on the size, dimension, use, or demolition of the previous structure. Mr. Costa responded that the previous structure was a chicken-coop/one-car garage that burned approximately 16 years ago. Mr. Costa continued that he used re-claimed historic oak, barn siding to construct a 14' gathering-area along the footprint of the previous structure.

Mr. Liebel asked for clarity on whether the Commission would have had the opportunity to review, had the application first gone to Zoning. Ms. Merritt replied that the application would have been flagged for "Historic Review" in the permitting system, and that the applicants would have been notified to contact our office. Ms. Merritt continued that sometimes, it is preferred for the Commission to review applications before Zoning, as the LPC often make suggestions that are in line with zoning requirements, and one review generally facilitates the other.

Mr. Weston moved to not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness, or a Notice to Proceed for the continued construction of the accessory structure. Further, the Commission requested that the outstanding zoning be addressed, and that the applicants return with new plans that adhere to size, scale, massing, and location that are compatible with the Historic Design Guidelines. The motion was seconded by Mr. Johnson, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Liebel, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

Additionally, the Commission determined that the applicants return to the Landmarks Preservation Commission within 90 days, with a new proposal that complies with the Historic Design Guidelines. The deadline for resubmission was set on, or before the June 13th, 2024 meeting.

Ms. Merritt added that code enforcement cases are typically addressed in 3–6-month increments, and that a new notice would be issued if the work was not addressed within the established timeframe.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Additions and Infill: 1-7, Roofs: 1-13, Windows and Doors: 1-8, and Façade Materials: 1-12. County Code Sec. 32-7-405.

- **8.** Greenwood (Deford House),” Board of Education of Baltimore County Property, 6901 North Charles Street, Towson. Final Landmark #57. GREENWOOD (DEFORD HOUSE). In-kind roof, parapet coping, and gutter and downspout replacements [County Council District #6].

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

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Roofs: 1-13. 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 II approval for work reviewed by Maryland Historic Trust:

- “Glen Arm Station” BTR 5205 LLC Property, 5205 Glen Arm Road, Glen Arm. Final Landmark #391. GLEN ARM STATION & SETTING (EXCLUDING POST-1981 ADDITIONS AND SHEDS). Amendments to approved Part II for roof color change, interior wall finishes, and exterior signage [County Council District #3].
- “Dorl Property”, 706 Stoneleigh Road, Towson. Contributing structure in the Stoneleigh National Register Historic District. Part II approval for repairs and painting to the front entry, 34 shutters, and various windows; and the refinishing of the original wood floors [County Council District #6].
- “Bowie Property,” 100 N Beechwood Ave, Catonsville. Contributing structure in the Old Catonsville National Register Historic District. Part II approval for a roof replacement, exterior woodwork repairs, exterior painting, and electrical upgrades [County Council District #1].
- “Alcarese Property,” 616 Murdock Road, Towson. Contributing structure in the Anneslie National Register Historic District. Part II approval for a roof replacement [County Council District #6].

Other Business

Ms. Merritt shared that the updated Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines were reviewed at a scheduled, public hearing on March 12, 2024.

Next meeting April 11th, 2024

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

The meeting adjourned at 7:18 PM.

JCB;jcb