Minutes
Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission
May 9, 2019 Meeting

Call to order; introduction of Commission members; pledge of allegiance to the Flag; statement of purpose and operating procedures

Mr. Rob Brennan, Chairperson, opened the regular monthly meeting of the Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) at 6:10 p.m. The following Commission members were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Carol Allen</td>
<td>Mr. Ed Hord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. C. Bruce Boswell</td>
<td>Ms. Nancy W. Horst, Vice-Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert P. Brennan, Chair</td>
<td>Ms. Faith Nevins Hawks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Louis Diggs</td>
<td>Ms. Cathryn Pinheiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mitch Kellman</td>
<td>Mr. Jon Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Wendy Mclver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Stephen P. Myer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Raymond Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Qutub U. K. Syed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David S. Thaler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attending County staff, Teri Rising (Preservation Services staff), Kaylee Justice (Planning staff), C. Pete Gutwald (Director), Jeff Mayhew (Deputy Director) and Jenifer Nugent (Chief of Development Review and Strategic Planning).

1. **Review of the Agenda**

Ms. Rising reported one change to the Preliminary Agenda published May 2nd, 2019.

2. **Approval of the Minutes**

Mr. Brennan asked if anyone proposed changes to the April 11th, 2019 Minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Brennan called for a motion to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Thaler moved to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Allen, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Kellman, Ms. Mclver, Mr. Myer, Mr. Scott and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.

Mr. Syed joined the meeting at 6:12 PM.
3. **Consent Agenda**

Ms. Rising read the Action Recommendations for Consent Agenda Items 6 and 9.

Mr. Brennan called for a motion. Mr. Thaler moved to approve the Consent Agenda items as presented. Mr. Myer seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Allen, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Mr. Scott, Mr. Syed and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.

**Items for Discussion and Vote**

4. “Saint John’s United Methodist Church”, 216 W. Seminary Avenue, Lutherville; Contributing structure in the Lutherville County Historic District; MIHP # BA-0330; Replace wood church doors with composite clad wood doors [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Rising introduced the project which involved the proposed replacement of two sets of wood doors on the front of the church that had suffered from extensive water damage on the bottoms. She provided information about the Technical Committee that met with church representatives on May 6th, 2019 which consisted of herself, Mr. Brennan and Mr. Myer. The resulting report was placed in the binders. Ms. Rising explained that the church representatives had confirmed the doors not to be historic and were believed to have been installed sometime in the mid 1960s when additional renovations occurred. She described the existing doors as solid wood with wood veneer cladding that simulated vertical boards to match the solid transom above and added that the bottoms of the doors had started to shred and the wood veneers were pulling away from the wood. During the site visit, the consensus was that the damage resulted from water and related dampness from water that pooled or came into the church due to the way the concrete steps and porch were constructed. Ms. Rising explained that while the application submitted by the church’s contractor suggested Boral clad wood doors, which was PVC or vinyl, the church representatives indicated they supported replacing them in kind with wood and wood veneers. She added that they also proposed removing and reinstalling the existing hardware and using the same items or a replacement in kind painted black to match if the hinges or screws cannot be reused. The current screws holding the hinge straps had square heads and matched the gothic look of the door design. Ms. Rising explained that the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings recommended replacing a missing historic door with a new one that matched the original if physical, pictorial, or photographic evidence existed to document its appearance. Absent that, they suggest the door may be replaced with new that was compatible with the style and character of the historic building. She added that the existing doors proposed for replacement are compatible with the style and character of the historic building, consequently replacing them in-kind and reusing the hardware would be consistent with the National Park Service standards.

After determining that no one had signed up to speak on behalf of the project, Mr. Brennan shared his impressions from the site visit and summarized the findings of the Technical
Committee. He agreed with the condition of the doors as describing by staff and the likely site conditions that had led to their deterioration. Mr. Brennan added that the existing interior and exterior operable hardware components were to be reused and that new interior panic bars would likely be added to the one pair of doors currently lacking them.

Mr. Boswell expressed his concerns about the recommendation involving reusing the existing strap hinges and hardware if possible and asked the Technical Committee members if there was visible rust. Mr. Brennan responded that he had not seen any rust. Mr. Boswell commented that there was no incentive to reuse the hardware if the recommendation allowed for the possibility to replace due to the fact it was easier to work with new.

Mr. Thaler asked if the straps were historic. Ms. Rising responded that she thought they could be and added that discussions with the church representatives led her to believe the straps would be reused but that some other elements might need replacement.

Mr. Boswell reiterated his concerns about the loss of the hardware should a choice be given to replace without further consultation with the Commission. Mr. Myer stated he thought the hardest part would involve their actual removal but believed they could come off.

Mr. Thaler suggested that a member of the Technical Committee should make the motion. Mr. Myer moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of the existing doors using wood and wood veneer with the same width as the matching transoms, the existing hardware strap hinges should be refurbished, reused and painted black. Ms. Allen seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Allen, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Mr. Scott, Mr. Syed and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.


5. “Monkton Hotel”, 1900 Monkton Road, Monkton; Final Landmark # 35; Contributing structure in the Monkton County Historic District; MIHP # BA-0116; Install crushed concrete parking area and privacy fence [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Rising introduced the project, which was submitted as a result of an approved zoning petition involving commercial parking in a residential zone, and provided details about the May 6th, 2019 site visit made by the Technical Committee that consisted of Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer and herself. She summarized the discussion between the member and the applicant, Mr. Otterbein, involving the present residential and commercial use of the former hotel and stated that current parking fell short of the spaces needed to accommodate the ten residential tenants and three commercial tenants. Ms. Rising explained that the applicant wished to add approximately fourteen spots in an expanded parking area to be located on the north side of the hotel, but will likely only add thirteen spaces based on site constraints. She described the
proposed options for materials which were both pervious, one being recycled crushed concrete, the other CR-6 stone and added the applicant had indicated his contractor preferred to work with CR-6 stone. Ms. Rising summarized the construction details of the newly created lot which was to be bordered by 6 x 6 pressure-treated wood to contain the material and separated from the residential properties by a privacy fence made out of pressure-treated pine, with a natural stain. She noted that the applicant had anticipated matching the new privacy fence to the existing fence, but hoped to replace the existing stockade fence in the future and would like a more attractive scalloped design for the stockade privacy fence. Ms. Rising explained how the Standards for Rehabilitation approached the planning of new site elements and advised they should be as unobtrusive as possible in both location and design. She noted features like a parking area should preserve the historic relationship between the structure and protect any significant landscape features. Ms. Rising explained that the proposed parking area would be limited to current residents and business tenants which helps support the building’s current use and is concealed from street view by the hotel building and largely blocked from the view of trail visitors by the current stockade fence.

Ms. Rising confirmed that the Technical Committee did not publish a report. Mr. Thaler asked if the members had opinions to share. Mr. Myer provided his impressions of the site and proposed configuration of the thirteen new parking spaces and added his preference for CR-6 stone as the material to be used. Mr. Thaler questioned why recycled stone had also been suggested. Mr. Myer responded that it had been one of the options submitted by the owner. Ms. Rising clarified that the owner’s contractor had also expressed his preference for CR-6 and added the Planning Department had expressed their support for pervious material in the written comments addressing the zoning petition.

Mr. Brennan recognized Mr. Angelo Otterbein, owner of the property, and invited him to speak on behalf of the project.

Mr. Boswell asked how the parking area would be screened from the view of the residential buildings. Mr. Otterbein explained that the issue had been discussed at the zoning hearing and the privacy fence was the proposed solution. Mr. Boswell noted the reference to a County Landscape Architect in the final order related to the zoning petition and asked for more information about their role. Mr. Otterbein responded that he would need to provide details relating to the screening for review prior to obtaining a permit for the work. Mr. Kellman clarified that in most cases an approved landscape plan depicting the buffer between the proposed improvements and adjacent residential properties would be required. Mr. Thaler added that the issue was related to the zoning hearing and not under the purview of the Commission.

Mr. Otterbein reconfirmed his contractor’s preference for the CR-6 concrete. Mr. Syed commented that the recycled concrete could have small metal bits which could lead to flat tires once in a while.

Ms. McIver moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the parking area and materials, the privacy fence to be a scalloped stockade style. Mr. Syed seconded the motion, which
passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Allen, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Mr. Scott, Mr. Syed and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.

*(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Fences & Landscape, p. 4; National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, Historic Building Exterior: Adjacent New Construction on Site, Avoiding Incompatible Work & New Site Features)* County Code, Sec 32-7-403

**6. McLaughlin property, 1016 Windsor Road, Sudbrook Park; Contributing structure in the Sudbrook County Historic District; MIHP # BA-3034; Construct a 14’ x 28’ shed [County Council District # 2]*

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

*(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Additions & Infill, pp. 2-4)* County Code, 32-7-403

7. Wrzesien property, 23 Waugh Avenue, Glyndon; Non-contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District; Construct a one story addition [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Rising summarized the project which involved the construction of a one story addition joining the western elevation of a non-contributing house located on Waugh Avenue, a dead end street on the outer edge of the Glyndon County Historic District. She noted the applicant’s proposed modifications to the size of the addition and some of the materials from what was depicted on the elevation drawings, which would be revised following approval. Ms. Rising described her site visit on May 7th, 2019 and subsequent discussion with the contractor. She offered details about the 1950s era house and location on the road that dead ends into Emory Grove and explained that the newer homes on the street shared similar characteristics in terms of height and style and that the small homes typically had additions of varying age. Ms. Rising went on to describe the applicability of the Historic Design Guidelines to structural alterations involving a non-contributing house in terms of compatibility and effect to the overall Historic District and suggested the result of the proposed alteration would not produce a building that dominated the streetscape nor be visually intrusive.

Mr. Brennan recognized Mr. Joe Duschl, from Diversified Buildings Group, who confirmed that he was the contractor for the project.

Mr. Boswell asked for clarification involving the depiction on the front elevation drawing of a double line at the ridge of the roofline where the existing house met the proposed addition. Mr. Duschl responded that he believed the roof line to be continuous but acknowledged he did not do the plans. He added that the depictions of the roof on the other elevations shows the roofline tying together on the same plane and was unsure what it was supposed to represent. Mr. Thaler agreed that it was not shown on the side elevations and suggested a possible drawing error. Mr. Boswell remarked that the ridge line should be continuous otherwise there could be a problem between the rooflines. Mr. Duschl confirmed that the rooflines were meant to be continuous and would follow up with the architect.
Mr. Boswell moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness assuming the ridge is continuous across the new and old structures. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Allen, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Mr. Scott, Mr. Syed and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.

(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Additions & Infill, p. 4) County Code, Sec 32-7-403

Mr. Brennan asked Mr. Duschl to explain the reason behind the reduction in the size of the addition. Mr. Duschl stated that the owners wished to provide an extra setback buffer based on zoning requirements.

8. Behar property, 4611 Prospect Avenue, Glyndon; Non-contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District; Ex-post facto approval of wood fence in rear yard [County Council District #3]

Ms. Rising provided the background for the project which consists of ex-post facto approval for an already installed three rail wood paddock fence in the rear yard. The applicant applied for a fence permit for the work and was pending LPC review. Ms. Rising explained that staff had observed the fence installation during a recent site visit to another property on the street and asked Code Enforcement to notify the property owner he had needed review and a permit for the fence if no permits were on file with the Department of Permits, Approvals and Inspections. Since no Correction Notice had been issued by the time the property owner came in with the materials, the matter was scheduled immediately. She added that the fence was virtually identical to one approved by the LPC last September around the corner on Waugh Avenue.

Mr. Thaler commented that a fence of this height would not typically require a permit and asked if it was because the property was located in the Glyndon Historic District. Ms. Rising confirmed that was the reason.

Mr. Brennan recognized Mr. Jeffrey Behar, owner of the property who explained he was replacing an existing fence that was broken. He added that he was unaware of the requirements.

Mr. Thaler moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the fence as constructed. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Allen, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Mr. Scott, Mr. Syed and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.

(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Fences & Landscape, p. 4) County Code, Sec 32-7-403

**9. “Saffel House” (Whitman property), 4702 Butler Road, Glyndon; Contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District; MIHP # BA-0709; In-kind replacement of porch roof/bay window roof [County Council District # 2]**
Approved via the Consent Agenda to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for a Colonial seam style.

-(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Roofs, pp. 8-9) County Code, Sec 32-7-403

10. “Saint John’s Church Rectory”, 3738 Butler Road, Worthington Valley; Final Landmark # 32; MIHP # BA-0596; Replacement of non-original Rectory wood porch decking and columns with composite decking; Repair/replace in-kind Rectory porch roof/flashing; Install wood shutters and hardware [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Rising summarized the project involving the church rectory porch which included the replacement of non-original porch decking, steps and columns with composite materials. She described the additional repair items being proposed for the porch roof with slates being removed and reinstalled, or replaced in kind. Ms. Rising explained that the proposed replacement of the deteriorated siding on the dormers was with Versatex instead of wood and provided details for the installation of wood shutters where they previously existed. She noted the Commission’s approval in 2010 for the repair of some existing wood shutters and replacement with composite shutters in the lower visibility sides on the northern and western elevations. Ms. Rising reviewed the details of her site visit that took place on May 7th with the church representative and their contractor, and shared details about the history of the church and rectory. She noted the condition issues related to the areas proposed for rehabilitation and replacement and described past alterations that had been undertaken after approval from the Commission including a porch and addition to the rectory that were completed in 2000. Ms. Rising explained that the church was requesting the use of composite materials for the porch decking, steps and columns in a profile that matched the existing and the use of Versatex, instead of wood, on the dormers which were located on the northern and southern elevations. When considering the use of substitute materials, Ms. Rising outlined the guidance offered by the National Park Service and in the County Historic Design Guidelines, specifically mentioning the Commission’s 2014 retreat on the topic. She summarized the reasons typically behind their proposed use and how the materials should be evaluated for their appropriateness in rehabilitation projects.

Mr. Brennan recognized Mr. John Shilling, Lay Pastor and Property Manager of Saint John’s Church and Mr. Paul Dickover of PTD Custom Builders.

Mr. Boswell asked for clarification on the condition of the porch columns proposed for replacement, noting that the pictures did not suggest they had deteriorated to the point that they could not be repaired. Mr. Dickover pointed out areas located at the column base on the photographs that depicted cracking and explained that they were plastic. He added that when the columns were replaced they may have not been sealed correctly where they met the base which led to water getting in and creating variable gaps depending on weather conditions. Mr. Boswell questioned the need for replacement over rehabilitation and asked if the proposal was primarily due to long term maintenance concerns. Mr. Dickover agreed that the columns
were not rotting but indicated they were not in terrific shape overall and were continuously deteriorating due to existing flaws. Mr. Boswell suggested the columns could be rehabilitated.

Mr. Thaler commented that Mr. Boswell had a purist approach and requested additional information that supported the need to replace the columns. Mr. Dickover conceded that the columns could likely be saved, but explained that in doing so the costs would increase.

Mr. Shilling and Mr. Dickover pointed out that the columns were not original, which was noted by staff during the project’s introduction. Mr. Boswell and Mr. Thaler remarked that they had missed that piece of information. Ms. Rising explained that she had urged the Commission to consider the porch’s overall character and significance due to the fact that the materials were not historic.

Mr. Brennan observed that the style of the porch railing suggested it might be original. Mr. Dickover confirmed they matched part of an interior rail design and suggested they had likely been incorporated into the porch design each time the columns were replaced. Mr. Brennan noted the detailing in the pilasters as part of the door surround appeared to be different architecturally, more Greek Revival as compared to the Colonial Revival style of the columns. He asked if the existing style of the columns were to be maintained upon replacement. Mr. Dickover stated they were to be replaced exactly.

Mr. Thaler asked if there were capitals on the columns, Mr. Dickover confirmed their presence.

Mr. Scott asked Ms. Rising to confirm that no historic materials were being replaced in the project. She confirmed that none of the materials were historic with the exception of the dormer siding. Mr. Dickover commented that the pictures taken from underneath the porch and stairway also demonstrated the fact that it had been replaced sometime around 1990. Mr. Shilling added that the date was either 1992 or 2000. Ms. Rising agreed based on evidence in the property file.

Mr. Brennan requested additional information about the Versatex product proposed for use on the dormers. Mr. Dickover explained the material was 100% PVC and would be customized so the bead would match the profile of the existing materials. Mr. Brennan observed that the existing was less a siding but more of a tongue and groove pattern. Mr. Dickover agreed and confirmed that it did not lap. Mr. Boswell asked Mr. Dickover if that particular style was produced. He responded that they would have to customize by doing the tongue and groove and beading themselves and confirmed it would be sanded and painted to match the existing wood on the building.

Ms. Rising commented that she had also considered how accessing the dormers to perform regular maintenance of the wood would affect the roof slates and suggested it be avoided if possible. Mr. Thaler agreed and noted the difficulty in accessing that location.
Mr. Boswell moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the repair/in-kind replacement of the wood porch elements, the repair/in-kind replacement of the porch and dormer roof elements, and the installation of wood louvered shutters where they previously existed and a Notice to Proceed for the replacement of the porch decking and steps with painted composite decking that matches the existing color, width and tongue and groove profile as proposed, the replacement of the wood columns with painted composite columns that visually and dimensionally match the existing and the replacement of the wood shiplap dormer siding with painted composite material that visually matches the existing. Mr. Thaler seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Allen, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Mr. Scott, Mr. Syed and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.

(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Roofs, p. 9; Porches & Steps, p.4; National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, Preservation Brief # 45 - Preserving Historic Wood Porches. Preservation Brief # 16 -The Use of Substitute Materials on Historic Building Exteriors)

The following historic property tax credit applications were reported as approved by staff as either an emergency repair or due to the receipt of Part II approval for work reviewed by MHT:

Ley Property, 804 Hatherleigh Rd, Stoneleigh; MHT approval for in-kind slate replacement, fascia and flashing; repair of chimney crown/liner; replacement of water heater; repair and replacement of stucco; and repair of interior plaster. [County Council District # 5]

Nawrot Property, 7211 Oxford Rd, Stoneleigh; MHT approval for installation of HVAC system. [County Council District # 5]

Other Business

Ms. Rising mentioned the upcoming June 19, 2019 Retreat and reminded everyone to R.S.V.P and the June 3rd public hearing in front of the Baltimore County Council for the Glen Arm Railroad Station currently on the Preliminary Landmarks List.

Mr. Thaler asked if the Choate House had a hearing scheduled yet. Ms. Rising replied that she had been in contact with the new owner and explained to the representative the purpose of the designation when questioned about the possibility of demolition.

Ms. Rising shared the details about the recent dedication of the Cromwell Valley Park Lime Kilns and their official inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places and the upcoming Water Ways program and exhibit at the Historical Society of Baltimore County.

Mr. Scott let everyone know about the opening of the Todd House for visitors.
Mr. Brennan provided details about the Preservation Maryland Stewardship Award which would be presented to the owners of Mount Welcome Retreat, the project had been reviewed by the Commission.

Mr. Thaler moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Syed seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Allen, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Mr. Scott, Mr. Syed and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.

The meeting adjourned at 7:16 p.m.

TDR:tdr