Minutes
Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission
June 13, 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 6:03 p.m. The following Commission members were:

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

Attending County staff, Teri Rising (Preservation Services staff), Taylor Bensley (Planning staff), and C. Pete Gutwald (Director).

1. Review of the Agenda

Ms. Rising reported two changes to the Preliminary Agenda published June 6th, 2019.

Mr. Diggs entered the meeting at 6:05 PM.

2. Approval of the Minutes

Mr. Brennan asked if anyone proposed changes to the May 9th, 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. Myer seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Nevins Hawks, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.
3. **Consent Agenda**

Ms. Rising read the Action Recommendations for Consent Agenda Items 5, 8, 11 and 13.

Ms. McIver noted the absence of the Monkton Hall property owner and questioned whether the Commission had purview over colors as she thought the sign was too bold for Monkton. Ms. Rising confirmed the Commission did not and added there were other guidelines the proposed signage needed to follow because of the existing zoning. She explained the new sign was replacing an existing sign and would be installed using the same fittings and believed it was consistent with the Historic Design Guidelines.

Mr. Thaler recommended Item No. 11 be removed from the Consent Agenda for full discussion with agreement from Mr. Brennan.

Mr. Brennan called for a motion on the remaining items. Mr. Thaler moved to approve the Consent Agenda items as presented. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Nevins Hawks, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.

**Items for Discussion and Vote**

4. "Halethorpe Colored School" and setting (Lot 64 – Plat of East Halethorpe), 1900 Northeast Avenue, Halethorpe

Ms. Rising explained that due to scheduling conflicts, the Public Hearing had been postponed until the September 12, 2019 meeting. She added that the building was owned by Baltimore County and the nomination had been submitted by the community with support from the County Council office.

Mr. Thaler asked if the County was required to follow the applicable landmark designation regulations. Ms. Rising confirmed they were due to language in the County Code.

**5. Monde Property, 1554 S. Rolling Road, Relay; Contributing structure in Relay County Historic District; MIHP # BA-2531; Part II approval for repair/replacement of roof shingles/replacement of roof system [County Council District # 1]**

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

*(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Roofs, p. 8 & p. 10) County Code, Sec 32-7-403; 11-2-201*
6. Simon property, 901 Adana Road, Sudbrook Park; Contributing structure in the Sudbrook County Historic District (Expansion 2); Widen existing front pathway and steps [County Council District # 2]

Ms. Rising introduced the item which involved the widening of an existing brick walkway leading to 3 front concrete steps. She noted that the brick walkway was in severe disrepair and in need of replacement. Ms. Rising explained that the applicant wished to widen the walkway to approximately 4 ½” for safety and convenience reasons and replace the 3 current concrete steps with 3 brick paver steps to match the new walkway and be wider. Ms. Rising referenced the letter from the Sudbrook Park Advisory Committee that offered an opinion on the proposal with some suggestions. She explained the materials and configuration used for the walkways specifically in this section of Sudbrook Park were a hybrid of concrete, asphalt, and some brick without a prevailing style, and based on research by staff, and past approvals of the Commission, it did not seem that the brick was original, nor did it seem that the walkways and step material and layout are considered character defining. Ms. Rising described the history of the homes which were built in the 1940s and met F.H.A. standards with concrete sidewalks and curbs. She added it would seem unusual to have used brick and the Commission had also approved the replacement of brick with concrete in the past.

Ms. Rising noted the owner was not able to attend and staff would be able to answer any questions.

Mr. Hord moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Ms. Nevins Hawks seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Nevins Hawks, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.

(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Fences & Landscape, p. 2) County Code, 32-7-403

7. “Howser House” (Vetock property), 5129 South Rolling Road, Relay; Contributing structure in the Relay County Historic District; MIHP # BA-2517; Part II approval for wood repair around window, door and roof gable [County Council District # 1]

Ms. Rising summarized the proposal which involved a Part II application for the repair/in-kind replacement of wood siding and decorative brackets. She explained that the applicants had received a tax credit for work involving the door and surrounding siding in 2011 but communicated to staff it was possible the door was not properly sealed leading to the damage. Ms. Rising added that the new Part II application included repair of the siding and additional work not previously submitted, however, staff did not typically support awarding new tax credits to redo work that already received tax credit benefits because it did not meet the eligibility criteria outlined in the County Code. Ms. Rising shared concerns about the cause of the wood deterioration and recommended additional investigation to determine the source as well as more detailed documentation that demonstrated deterioration and rot involving the decorative brackets/gingerbread before supporting the need for replacement.
Mr. Brennan asked for clarification on the deferment of the gingerbread replacement. Ms. Rising explained that the scope of work included with the application made assumptions about the condition of the wood and treatment without a full investigation of the condition of the elements. She contended that the treatment recommendations could change based on these assessments and recommended to defer until more information could be obtained.

Mr. Brennan determined no representative was in attendance to speak on the item.

Ms. Pinheiro asked for clarification on whether or not they were voting on the tax credit. Ms. Rising confirmed that staff recommended approval for some of the work as eligible for a tax credit but the other item was not.

Mr. Diggs moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for Part II approval of the replacement of wood window sills/trim with wood that matches the original in appearance, design, proportion and profiles and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of the deteriorated siding around the door with wood siding that matches the original in appearance, design, proportion and profiles. Mr. Thaler seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Nevins Hawks, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.


**8. “Mersinger House”, 14 Chatsworth Avenue, Glyndon; Contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District; MIHP # BA-0737; Replace freestanding light fixture [County Council District # 2]

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

(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Fences & Landscape, p. 2) County Code, Sec 32-7-403

9. “Mersinger House”, 14 Chatsworth Avenue, Glyndon; Contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District; MIHP # BA-0737; Installation of solar panels on the rear roof [County Council District # 2]

Ms. Rising explained the nature of the work being proposed which included the installation of solar panels on a contributing home in the Glyndon County Historic District. She added that the solar company prepared materials including the details about the panels and potential visual impact it may have. Ms. Rising described the physical characteristics of the house and age of construction and commented that the porch roof was considered eligible to be replaced in 2011 as part of a historic tax credit application. Ms. Rising provided additional details on the
proposed solar panel installation including their location which was to be on the gable ell and porch roof, both of which were contributing elements. She articulated how staff interpreted the Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines recommendations for solar panel installation and indicated that solar panels proposed for sloping roofs should generally be attached to rear slopes so they cannot be viewed from a public street or limited to an unobtrusive location on the site. Ms. Rising referenced the mock up drawing submitted with the application that clearly depicted how some panels would be visible after installation and shared that staff believed it to be possible due to the color and projection that the proposed panels on the rear slope of the main block may also be seen from the street. She explained that solar panels installed on a historic property in a location that cannot be seen from the ground generally meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, however, an installation that negatively impacts the historic character of a property will not meet the Standards. Consequently, staff recommended the use of the proposed panels be limited to the side slope of the rear ell and the rear porch roof.

Mr. Brennan recognized Brian Bubnash, owner of the property, who explained he asked the solar company to prepare the application for review.

Mr. Brennan asked Ms. Rising to clarify the recommendation of staff which included limiting the installation of panels beyond those that were noted as being visible from the street. Ms. Rising responded that an examination of Google street view and pictures in the file led staff to believe it was possible to see the panels on the side roof of the real ell due to the close proximity of the homes and because the sidewalks in that section of Chatsworth Avenue curved inward closer to the homes.

Mr. Hord commented that he did not see the rear panels projecting above the eave of the roof on the rear ell.

Ms. Rising stated that she was being very conservative in her assessment of the visual impact from the panels and considered the close proximity of the homes to one another, the profile of the curving sidewalk, and the fact the panels were irreversible as part of her recommendation. She added that she believed there was a possibility they could be viewed from a public right of way.

Mr. Bubnash asked the Commission how a difference of opinion relating to the visibility of the panels would be resolved and noted the importance of using solar technology as part of seeking energy independence.

Mr. Thaler asked Ms. Rising to elaborate on the reasons she believed the panels would be visible. In response, Ms. Rising cited several visual examples she prepared and shared with the Commission members. Both Mr. Hord and Mr. Thaler concluded the panels would not be seen.
Ms. Nevins Hawks asked if there were any concerns about visual impacts to the neighbors. Ms. Rising explained she was examining the visual impact of the panels from the public view since the Historic Design Guidelines recommend they not be visible from a public right of way.

Mr. Schmidt referenced the section of the Historic Design Guidelines that discussed solar panel visibility and noted they were written to allow for interpretation. He added that he believed it to be a favorable installation.

Mr. Brennan asked Mr. Bubnash if it were possible to move the panels to the rear lower roof. Mr. Bubnash replied that the solar company had placed the panels as densely as they could so the historic character of the house would be retained.

Mr. Thaler asked for clarification on the visibility of the lower panels. Ms. Rising commented that the solar company demonstrated the lower panels to be visible on their drawings submitted with the application.

Ms. McIver questioned whether or not any of the neighbors had solar panels. Mr. Bubnash commented that it had been mentioned previously that this would be the first installation.

Mr. Hord stated that the impact of the visible panels were marginal and did not detract from the street view.

Mr. Thaler moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the solar panel installation as proposed. Mr. Hord seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Mr. Myer, Ms. Nevins Hawks, Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Thaler. Ms. Horst, Ms. McIver, and Ms. Pinheiro voted against the motion.

(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Roofs, p. 13; National Park Service, Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines, Guidelines on Sustainability: Solar Technology) County Code, Sec 32-7-403

10. McLaughlin property, 1016 Windsor Road, Sudbrook Park; Contributing structure in the Sudbrook County Historic District; MIHP # BA-3034; Enclose rear porch to create mudroom [County Council District # 2]

Ms. Rising summarized the project which involved the enclosure of a rear porch to create a new mudroom and described the architectural style of the house. She noted it as one of the earliest cottages constructed in Sudbrook Park and explained that future owners had made changes to the home which included the expansion of the side porch and construction of the rear addition. Ms. Rising shared that Mr. Myer and herself had visited the property to discuss the project with the owner on June 12, 2019 and explained how the proposed conversion of the porch retained existing openings, including the window located on the rear wall of the original house. She provided the treatment recommendations from the County’s Historic Design Guidelines and Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for additions and alterations and indicated the project as proposed met those standards.
Mr. Brennan recognized Bruce and Lara McLaughlin, owners of the property, and invited them to speak on behalf of their project. Ms. McLaughlin commented that the alteration would not be visible from the public right of way and the original window on the home would be retained as part of the new design.

Mr. Myer summarized his observations from the site visit and noted how the design of the staircase as integrated with a landing would reduce the visual impact.

Mr. Hord commented that the addition would be set back from the face of the great room which was confirmed by Ms. McLaughlin.

Mr. Brennan noted the use of pressure treated material for the visible framing and rails. Mr. McLaughlin commented that the contractor advised them on the need to wait for painting so the wood could dry out. Mr. Brennan explained it could take up to a year or more in some cases. Mr. Myer suggested they look for kiln dried wood to avoid that length of a delay.

Ms. Nevins Hawks asked if the bracket detailing on the porch was important. Ms. McLaughlin replied that they were responsible for the installation of those items.

Mr. Myer moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project as proposed. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Nevins Hawks, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.

(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Porches & Steps, p. 2; Additions & Infill, p. 10) County Code, Sec 32-7-403

11. “Monkton Hall”, 1901 Monkton Road; Contributing structure in the Monkton County Historic District; MIHP # BA-0506; Installation of new commercial signage where sign previously existed using existing fittings [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Rising summarized the project and provided photos of the sign that previously existed and the new sign. She confirmed they would be using the existing fittings without a need to create new holes.

Ms. McIver expressed concerns on the design of the new sign due to the fact it would be installed on the street side of the building and had a prominent location on Monkton Road in the heart of Monkton village. She added that the design would be out of place and not compatible based on the age of the building.

Mr. Thaler agreed with the assessment that the new sign was not a nineteenth century sign but questioned whether or not the design was under their purview.
Ms. Rising indicated that staff considered the overall adverse effect the signage would have on the Historic District but was more concerned on the irreversible aspects the installation would have on the masonry. She added that there would need to be a justification found within the Historic Design Guidelines to oppose the sign.

Ms. Nevins Hawks suggested they be cautious in their assessment of the sign design due to the number of signs erected in the area and noted the fact this owner came through the right channels. Mr. Hord stated that the sign was reversible.

Mr. Hord moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Ms. Nevins Hawks seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Mr. Myer, Ms. Nevins Hawks, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Thaler. Ms. McIver voted against the motion.

(Citing National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, Preservation Brief # 25 - The Preservation of Historic Signs) County Code, Sec 32-7-403

12. Gary property, 705 Woodland Drive, Relay; Infill lot within Relay County Historic District; Construct a two story house on lot created by minor subdivision (approved by LPC on 7/12/12 – PAI # 12-003M) [County Council District # 1]

Ms. Rising summarized the application which involved a new home to be built on a vacant lot within the Relay County Historic District. The applicant provided architectural drawings representing the proposed new construction with a matching site plan. The lot was created as part of a minor subdivision in 2012 that was reviewed and approved by the LPC. She explained that the creation of the lots came with the written expectation the new infill would be subject to the requirements for County Historic Districts. Ms. Rising described the existing homes on Woodland Drive, which were primarily mid to late 20th century construction with contributing homes on Viaduct Avenue to the west and Rolling Road to the east. She summarized the recommendations from the Historic Design Guidelines for infill projects within County Historic Districts and the importance of architectural compatibility, height, massing and use of quality materials in new construction. Ms. Rising commented that the proposed design of the new house met the Historic Design Guidelines in light of the streetscape pattern and location within the Historic District, however, the applicant’s preference for vinyl siding over the choice of a cementitious product did not. She provided examples of other infill projects where the LPC approved a cementitious product over vinyl within the same Historic District and on dead end lots.

Mr. Brennan recognized Ben and Jessie Gary who were the contract purchasers of the infill lot. Mr. Gary described the wooded nature of the lot and the setback of the new home which would not be highly visible from the street. He added that the new house would sit behind an existing pumping station and commented that the other houses on the street were modern construction. Ms. Gary expressed concern about using wood materials on the home due to the wooded nature of the lot and questioned how well it would age.
Mr. Brennan asked Ms. Rising to clarify that the LPC had approved the subdivision but no plans were submitted with it at the time. She confirmed that no specific plan was approved and added that language had been included with the approval to reinforce the need for LPC approval on any proposed infill. Ms. Rising stated they had been consistent in the application of the Historic Design Guidelines and approving cementitious siding regardless of the location within a Historic District.

Mr. Gary noted the use of brick and vinyl on many other houses on the street. He indicated the proposed vinyl product they wished to use had the same look of cedar shake shingles and would be easier to maintain.

Mr. Hord commented that he thought wood cedar shingles would last a long time and shared that he had used them on a house he had built. Ms. Gary questioned the cost of using wood shingles and the extra maintenance responsibilities.

Mr. Brennan explained that the LPC was familiar with various building products and have moved to the more durable cementitious type instead of the synthetic variety for use in Historic Districts except where it had been used previously. He noted the infill project in Relay the LPC had reviewed the previous year, which proposed vinyl for use in the siding, but approved with a cementitious product instead.

Ms. McIver asked why the applicants had not considered cementitious siding. Mr. Gary explained the costs would increase significantly if they could not use vinyl. Ms. Rising noted the existence of various cementitious products which were not as expensive as the Hardie brand.

Mr. Thaler asked Mr. Brennan for his opinion on the proposed materials. Mr. Brennan expressed his support for using the Historic Design Guidelines in Historic Districts and believed it was their responsibility to be good stewards. He added that authenticity was important in Historic Districts and there was a need to hold the line at a certain point for current projects and those in the future as it would help the District get better and not worse over time.

Ms. Horst asked about the lack of windows on either side of the house. Mr. Hord commented that the bedrooms would benefit from the addition of light. Ms. Gary replied that they preferred the design as it was.

Ms. Horst moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness, the siding to be a cementitious product or wood. Mr. Hord seconded the motion. Mr. Hord proposed an amendment to the seconded motion to require windows on the blank side elevations. Mr. Thaler seconded the amendment which failed to pass with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Brennan, Ms. Horst, Mr. Hord, and Mr. Myer. Mr. Diggs, Ms. McIver, Ms. Nevins Hawks, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt, and Mr. Thaler voted against the amendment. The motion passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Mr. Myer, Ms. McIver, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Thaler. Ms. Nevins Hawks voted against the motion.
13. Marquess Property, 1719 Arlington Avenue, Relay; Contributing structure in Relay County Historic District; MIHP # BA-2524; Shed installation in rear yard [County Council District # 1]

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

Other Business

Ms. Rising introduced Ms. Taylor Bensley who recently became the new Historic Planner and reminded everyone about the upcoming retreat on the CZMP process scheduled for June 19, 2019 and the Preservation Maryland conference scheduled for July 24, 2019.

Mr. Thaler introduced his third year intern, Ms. Audrey Eldridge, who was in the audience.

Ms. Horst moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Brennan seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Nevins Hawks, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.

The meeting adjourned at 7:31 p.m.