Minutes  
Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission  
July 11, 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 6:01 p.m. The following Commission members were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. C. Bruce Boswell</td>
<td>Mr. Louis Diggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert P. Brennan, Chair</td>
<td>Mr. John Holman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Faith Nevins Hawks</td>
<td>Mr. David S. Thaler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ed Hord</td>
<td>Mr. Christopher Weston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mitch Kellman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Wendy McIver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Stephen P. Myer</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. Raymond Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Qutub U. K. Syed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

1. Selection of Vice-Chair

Mr. Brennan let the Commission know that Ms. Nancy W. Horst, former Vice-Chair, had been replaced by Mr. Weston, and the position of Vice-Chair was now vacant. Mr. Brennan asked for a nomination for a new candidate for Vice-Chair.

Mr. Hord moved that Mr. Kellman fill the role as Vice-Chair. Mr. Boswell seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Ms. Hawks, Mr. Hord, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt, and Mr. Scott. There were no dissenting votes.

Mr. Kellman thanked the Commission members for allowing him to serve as Vice-Chair.

(Authority for Action - Baltimore County Code Article 3: Title 3: 1203: Officers)
2. **Review of the Agenda**

Ms. Rising reported three changes to the Preliminary Agenda published July 3\textsuperscript{rd}, 2019.

3. **Approval of the Minutes**

Mr. Brennan asked if anyone proposed changes to the June 13\textsuperscript{th}, 2019 Minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Brennan called for a motion to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Myer moved to approve the Minutes as drafted. Ms. Pinheiro seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Ms. Hawks, Mr. Hord, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt, and Mr. Scott. There were no dissenting votes.

4. **Consent Agenda**

Ms. Rising gave background information and read the Action Recommendations for Consent Agenda Items 7, 9, 11, 14, and 15.

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

**Items for Discussion and Vote**

5. **“Baltimore County Jail” 222 Courthouse Court, Towson; Final Landmark # 84; MIHP # BA-205; Replacement of an 800 square foot portion of roof [County Council District # 5]**

Ms. Rising introduced the project which involved the removal of existing membrane and insulation on a circa 1980 built up roof over the original Commissary, and the installation of new insulation and built up roofing. Ms. Rising noted that the area of work involved is 800 square feet, and that the existing copper flashings, gutters, and downspouts will be reused. The Historic Review Application also included a proposal for the installation of a fence; Ms. Rising explained that because the site had no Historic Environmental Setting, the applicant is free to proceed with the fence without review. Ms. Rising added that the roof materials being replaced were not historic, and the proposed treatment would not visually impact the structure.

Mr. Brennan recognized Mr. Martin Azola, who was representing Towson Jail Associates LLC.

Mr. Boswell moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project as proposed. Mr. Myer seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Ms. Hawks, Mr. Hord, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt, and Mr. Scott. There were no dissenting votes.
Mr. Brennan asked why the item was not on the Consent Agenda. Ms. Rising replied that Baltimore County owned the building and, for the purpose of transparency and not to make anyone ask for it to be pulled from the Consent Agenda, staff typically did not place County owned buildings on the Consent Agenda.

6. “Howser House” (Vetock Property), 5129 S. Rolling Road, Relay; Contributing structure in Relay County Historic District; MIHP # BA-2517; Part II approval for an amended scope of work for repair around the roof gables [County Council District # 1]

Ms. Rising explained that at the June 13\textsuperscript{th}, 2019 LPC meeting, the Commission voted to approve two of the three proposed work items of the original Part II tax credit application. The Commission deferred approval of the third work item involving the replacement of decorative gingerbread pending additional documentation that detailed the deterioration and rot. Ms. Rising noted that the applicant had since informed staff that the brackets were not original as was originally stated, and the wood had been repaired with new wood multiple times. Ms. Rising stated that the applicant had provided documentation that demonstrated the deterioration and rot, and information about the reattachment. Consequently, staff supported the replacement with painted wood that replicated the existing design and was attached with additional brazing as needed; the wood used should be wood less likely to warp and decay.

Mr. Brennan commented that the gingerbread looked repairable. Ms. Rising responded that the contractor contended replacement was necessary for some of the gingerbread and the pieces were not original.

Mr. Boswell asked if the homeowner provided any evidence that the gingerbread was not original. Ms. Rising said there was no evidence if it was, or was not, original. Ms. Hawks stated that there appeared to be various types of wood used, which may be why the homeowner did not believe it was original to the home.

Ms. Rising noted that at the June 13\textsuperscript{th}, 2019 meeting, staff recommended no replacement; staff now recommended repair where possible, and replacement when necessary.

Mr. Syed joined the meeting at 6:16 PM.

Ms. Hawks moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project as proposed. Mr. Myer seconded the motion with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Ms. Hawks, Mr. Hord, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Syed. There were no dissenting votes.
**7.** “Sweet House”, 5130 S. Rolling Road, Relay; Contributing structure in Relay County Historic District; MIHP # BA-2523; Part II approval for in-kind replacement of shingles; replacement of air conditioning central air system air mover and compressor [County Council District # 1]

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

(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Roofs, p. 10; National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, Preservation Brief # 24 - Heating, Ventilating, and Cooling Historic Buildings—Problems and Recommended Approaches) County Code, Sec 32-7-403; 11-2-20

8. “Heritage Society of Essex Middle River”, 516 Eastern Avenue, Essex; Final Landmark # 130; MIHP # BA-2613; Mounting of a Historic Landmark plaque [County Council District # 7]

Ms. Rising gave the background on the project, which involved the installation of a Historic Landmark plaque recognizing the history of the building and its Final Landmark designation. She noted that Baltimore County Property Management had been assisting with technical aspects of the project. Ms. Rising explained that the proposed plaque would be anchored in a way that avoided the masonry, used the mortar joints, and will not obscure significant features of the building. Ms. Rising noted that she had been working with the Heritage Society for the past few months.

Mr. Brennan asked if Baltimore County had an adopted plaque design. Ms. Rising replied that they did not. Mr. Brennan remarked it was something to consider doing.

The mockup of the plaque stated “The Essex Station was the first paid fire and police station with only one bay door for equipment.” Mr. Scott asked for confirmation that this station was the first of its kind in Baltimore County. Ms. Rising replied she did not fact check the information on the sign, but it was reasonable. Mr. Brennan asked if she would fact check. Ms. Rising stated she would if they asked her to.

Mr. Schmidt noted that he would prefer the sign to be freestanding, rather than attaching foreign objects to masonry buildings. Ms. Rising responded that she had discussed that with the applicant; however, because the site was located on a state road about to undergo streetscaping and a State Highways project, and because the site had an adjacent war memorial that was part of the landmark, the applicant and staff did not want a freestanding sign to be somewhere in the way. Consequently, the applicant opted for, and staff supported, a sign anchored into mortar joints.

Mr. Hord moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project as proposed. Mr. Syed seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Ms. Hawks, Mr. Hord, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McLver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Syed. There were no dissenting votes.

(Citing National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, Preservation Brief # 25 – The Preservation of Historic Signs) County Code, Sec 32-7-403
**9.** Sunderland Property, 704 Cliveden Road W, Sudbrook Park; Contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District; Repair of an existing parking pad in front of home and creation of new driveway to existing two-car garage [County Council District # 2]

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

*(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Fences & Landscapes, p. 3) County Code, Sec 32-7-403*

10. “Monkton Hotel”, 1900 Monkton Road, Monkton; Final Landmark # 35; Contributing structure in the Monkton County Historic District; MIHP # BA-116; Installation of new signage on the front of the building [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Rising introduced the project for the installation of a 10’ square foot sign for the Monkton Hotel. The proposal for the sign was on the front of the building, which leads to the Monkton Hotel Café. Ms. Rising explained that the applicant had spent the past six months working with environmental design firm David Ashton Designs to create an identity for the hotel and the commercial tenants now occupying the space. The proposed sign was an unlit, pin-based lettering sign covering the least amount of brickwork possible. Ms. Rising further explained that current regulations only allow the sign to have an 8’ square foot footprint, but the applicant maintained this was proportionally too small for the building, and was seeking support for the variance along with the approval, citing the National Park Service Preservation Brief on new commercial signage, which explained that new signs should respect the size, scale, and design of historic buildings, and not obscure significant features.

Mr. Brennan recognized Mr. Angelo Otterbein, the representative of the project and owner of the Monkton Hotel.

Mr. Brennan acknowledged that David Ashton Designs did a great job. Mr. Otterbein agreed and explained that he was seeking approval for the 10’ SF sign, rather than the permitted 8’ SF sign because he felt it looked the most appropriate.

Mr. Boswell agreed the 10’ SF sign looked the best, but questioned how to convey approval for the project being that they would approve it based on the specific sign design. Mr. Boswell explained a 10’ SF solid sign would be inappropriate and he did not want someone to come in seeking something similar later down the road. Ms. Rising stated the approval would be tied to the application, which cited the design, but the Commission should be specific in their motion. Mr. Kellman asked if Mr. Otterbein had applied for the variance. Mr. Otterbein said no, he had not done anything other than apply for the Historic Review. Mr. Kellman commented that the Zoning Office would require Mr. Otterbein to do a box around the design to determine the square footage. Mr. Kellman said the Commission should put something specific in with the Zoning Office that the support is tied to the design. Ms. Rising explained that the Department of Planning reviewed zoning cases and Historic Preservation would comment that the Commission saw the project, used the Design Guidelines to make a determination, and voted to issue a
Certificate of Appropriateness for the 10’ SF sign proposed. These comments would provide the Administrative Law Judge with the information that the Commission supported the request and why.

Mr. Scott asked if the pin-based letters were brass or vinyl. Mr. Otterbein replied that the letters would be brass and very lightweight. Mr. Scott clarified that there would be three to four places on each letter with attachments, and those attachments will be inserted into the mortar. Mr. Otterbein confirmed this and indicated it was the way it was proposed. He added the other way to do it would be to have a thin rail with the letters attached and then attach the rail to fewer places in the mortar.

Mr. Brennan asked if the sign was lit. Mr. Otterbein said no.

Mr. Boswell moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the 10’ SF sign using the box and circle boundaries measurement technique, specifying that attachments only be inserted into the mortar joints, and that the central picture of three mockup signs presented to the LPC on July 11th, 2019 was the design that was approved. Ms. McIver seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Ms. Hawks, Mr. Hord, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Syed. There were no dissenting votes.

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

**11.** “John A. Barker House” (Carnes property), 505 Sudbrook Lane, Sudbrook Park; Contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District; MIHP # BA-3023; Laying of stone pavers to formally create parking pad; Installation of wooden utility shed; Part II approval for roof and gutter replacement [County Council District # 2]

Approved via the Consent Agenda to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness

(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Roofs, p. 10; Fences & Landscapes, p. 3 & p. 5) County Code, Sec 32-7-403; 11-2-201

12. “Reese House” (Renaud property), 305 Morris Avenue, Lutherville; Contributing structure in the Lutherville County Historic District; MIHP # BA-320; Part II approval for replacement of gutters and downspouts, crown molding behind rear upper gutter, and Conductor Head [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Rising introduced the item which involved Part II approval for the replacement of gutters and downspouts, the crown molding behind the rear upper gutter, and conductor heads. Ms. Rising also explained that this project had been on the Consent Agenda, but was removed as the applicant was now proposing brown aluminum for the gutters, rather than galvanized steel as originally proposed. The applicant amended their scope of work following information that
the Commission had previously approved brown aluminum for gutters on a home down the street from him. Ms. Rising noted that the crown molding was not historic and was less than 30 years old.

Mr. Brennan determined that no one was there to speak on behalf of the project.

Mr. Brennan asked about the color of the galvanized steel versus the brown aluminum. Ms. Rising replied that the brown aluminum came in that color, rather than the applicant having to paint the gutters. Mr. Brennan asked if it was a copper color. Ms. Rising noted that the Commission did not have purview over color, but clarified they were brown.

Mr. Boswell explained it was not about the color, but rather if the Commission would support replacement from galvanized steel to aluminum. Ms. Rising remarked that the Commission had seen and approved both; galvanized steel being a bit heavier and more prone to rust if not painted inside and outside, whereas the aluminum was lighter and did not require painting. Mr. Boswell noted that the aluminum was also cheaper to install.

Mr. Renaud, the homeowner, introduced himself. He explained he thought galvanized gutters were the only option, but then learned he could do brown aluminum instead, which he found easier to maintain since they did not need to be painted.

Mr. Boswell asked if the color proposed was the standard brown. Mr. Renaud said yes, it was called Royal Brown, and was a half round single-bead.

Mr. Boswell stated that the tradeoff was the galvanized steel, if maintained, would last longer, and was more durable than aluminum, however, they required painting. Mr. Renaud stated he did not know how to go about painting them and was under the impression they would rust out. Ms. Rising commented they would rust if unpainted. Mr. Brennan asked if the inside of the gutter needed to be painted. Mr. Boswell said that was ideal. Mr. Hord added it would be harder to do later on.

Mr. Brennan asked Ms. Rising to pull up a photo of the existing Conductor Boxes. Mr. Renaud stated it was a fancier-looking box, and he was replacing it with one that looked as close as possible. Mr. Brennan commented the one proposed looked nice.

Mr. Hord moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the Part II approval for replacement of gutters and downspouts, crown molding behind rear upper gutter, and Conductor Heads as proposed. Mr. Myer seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Ms. Hawks, Mr. Hord, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Syed. There were no dissenting votes.

(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Roofs, pp. 10-11) County Code, Sec 32-7-403; 11-2-201
13. “Robert Townsend House (Catonsville Historical Society)” (Donovan’s property), 1824 Frederick Road, Catonsville; Final Landmark # 193; MIHP # 3070; Enclosure of existing 7’ x 10’ rear patio; [County Council District # 1]

Ms. Rising gave a background of the project, which involved the enclosure of an existing 7’ by 10’ rear patio to create a bathroom space in conjunction with the buildings conversion into a residential dwelling. She provided the history of the structure, which was constructed in 1941 and used as a residential dwelling until 1973, when it was donated to the Catonsville Historical Society for their museum. The structure was heavily altered in 1993 with the addition of a framed hyphen that connected to a 1970’s era accessory building. Ms. Rising stated that the patio space was likely created then. Further, she explained that the Catonsville Historical Society had relocated their items, and the site was being converted back into a residence. Ms. Rising noted that the landmark nomination from 2000 did not identify a specific, character defining, architectural feature. The building had a variety of existing façade materials, including vinyl windows and siding, and the enclosed patio would not be visible from the public right of way or harmful to any historical aspects of the site.

Mr. Brennan recognized Mr. Daniel Donovan, the applicant for the project.

Mr. Brennan asked if Mr. Donovan was using the existing foundation, slab, etc. Mr. Donovan replied yes.

Mr. Boswell said there was a discrepancy between the plans and the verbal description as the plans say 8’ 7” x 10’ enclosure, whereas the verbal description says 7’ x 10’. Mr. Donovan explained it could have been interior versus exterior dimensions with the framing. He stated the interior dimensions were 7’ x 10’. Mr. Boswell asked if Mr. Donovan was the architect. Mr. Donovan said he was the owner and also did the plans.

Mr. Boswell asked how the roof would intersect with the chimney and drain. Ms. Hawks asked if the plan was to extend the roofline. Mr. Donovan confirmed the roofline would stay the same. Mr. Hord noted the applicant was using the existing roof and columns and infilling the slab. Mr. Boswell clarified that the enclosure was staying within the footprint of the existing slab. Mr. Donovan said yes.

Mr. Boswell asked why there were no windows and why the plan showed exposed brick in the shower. For the window, Mr. Donovan stated that while windows were nice, there was not enough room with a vanity, mirrors, etc. to include one. For the exposed brick for the shower, Mr. Donovan asked if that was within the purview of the Landmarks Preservation Commission. Mr. Boswell confirmed it was not. Mr. Hord mentioned there may be issues with mold. Mr. Donovan replied that he planned to seal the brick, but the exterior brick was in great shape.

Mr. Myer moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the enclosure of the existing rear patio as proposed. Ms. McIver seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being
cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Ms. Hawks, Mr. Hord, Mr. Kellman, Ms. Mclver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Syed. There were no dissenting votes.

*(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Additions & Infill, p. 3)* County Code, Sec 32-7-403

**14.** “Caples House” (Steele property), 211 Central Ave, Glyndon; Contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District; MIHP # BA-776; Part II approval for the addition of central air conditioning [County Council District # 2]

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

*(Citing National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, Preservation Brief # 24 - Heating, Ventilating, and Cooling Historic Buildings—Problems and Recommended Approaches)* County Code, Sec 311-2-201

**15.** Carpenter Property, 713 Pleasant Hill Road, Oella; Contributing structure in the Oella National Register Historic District; Part II approval for replacement of an aging water heater, replacement of a water pipe, and installation of a sump pump [County Council District # 2]

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


**Other Business**

Ms. Rising reported on the following historic property tax credit application that was approved by staff as either an emergency repair or due to the receipt of Part II approval for work reviewed by MHT:

Truelove Property, 7414 Stanmore Court, Rodgers Forge; MHT approval for replacement of broken chimney flue; replacement of ice and water shield and roof felt paper; and replacement of all missing/broken or deteriorates slates on roof. [County Council District # 5]

Ms. Rising thanked the Commission members that attended the June 19th retreat. She also indicated it may be possible the Commission would be providing comments on CZMP issues in historic districts, however, it was still being discussed.

Ms. Rising reminded the Commission members there was no August meeting.

Mr. Brennan formally recognized Ms. Nancy Horst for her 13 years of exemplary service. Ms. Rising commented that she expected multiple replacements over the next few months, and a formal recognition of long-term members would be nice.
Mr. Syed moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Hord seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Ms. Hawks, Mr. Hord, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Pinheiro, Mr. Schmidt, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Syed. There were no dissenting votes.

The meeting adjourned at 7:09 PM.
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