Minutes
Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission
October 10, 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. C. Bruce Boswell</td>
<td>Ms. Cathryn Pinheiro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert P. Brennan, Chair</td>
<td>Mr. Jon Schmidt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Louis Diggs</td>
<td>Mr. Qutub U. K. Syed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Holman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ed Hord</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mitch Kellman, Vice-Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Wendy Mclver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Stephen P. Myer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Faith Nevins-Hawks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Raymond Scott</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David S. Thaler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Christopher Weston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attending County staff included Teri Rising (Preservation Services staff), Taylor Bensley (Preservation Services staff), Jenifer Nugent (Strategic Planning Division Chief), and C. Pete Gutwald (Director, Department of Planning).

1. **Review of the Agenda**

Ms. Rising reported there were no changes to the Preliminary Agenda published October 3, 2019.

2. **Approval of the Minutes**

Mr. Brennan asked if anyone proposed changes to the September 12th, 2019 Minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Brennan called for a motion to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Hord moved to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Myer seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Holman, Mr. Hord, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Nevins-Hawks, Mr. Scott, Mr. Thaler, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.
3. **Consent Agenda**

Ms. Rising gave background information and read the Action Recommendations for Consent Agenda Items 5, 6 and 7.

Mr. Brennan called for a motion on the items. Mr. Thaler moved to approve the Consent Agenda items as proposed. Mr. Boswell seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Holman, Mr. Hord, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Nevins-Hawks, Mr. Scott, Mr. Thaler, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

**Items for Discussion and Vote**

4. **Rauser Property, 1727 Magnolia Avenue, Relay; Contributing structure in the Relay County Historic District; Removal and expansion of a side entrance porch with roof [County Council District # 1]**

Ms. Bensley introduced the project, which involved the removal of an existing side entrance porch and a rebuild complete with a roof. She explained that the property was a corner lot at the intersection of Magnolia and Hazel Avenues, and was the last property before Hazel Avenue came to a dead end at the 195 sound wall. The proposed porch was similar to the front porch, which was approved by the Commission in October of 2016. The footprint including the roof overhang was proposed to be 12’ by 10’. Ms. Bensley continued that the roof of the porch would have Gaf Ultra Shingles to match the existing roof and the rail height solid porch wall would have shingles that matched those on the home and existing front porch; the porch would have aluminum downspouts and gutters and pressure treated wood stairs. She added that the homeowners were in the process of filing for an administrative variance for a 15.5’ side yard setback in lieu of the required 25’ side yard setback and that a site visit was conducted on September 30th, 2019.

Mr. Weston questioned if the 2’ roof overhang was appropriate for the proposed porch. Mr. Brennan agreed, but noted he felt it was the homeowner’s intent to match the existing front porch overhang.

Mr. Brennan informed the Commission that he, Ms. Nevins-Hawks, Ms. Rising, and Ms. Bensley visited the site and spoke with the homeowner on September 30th, 2019.

Mr. Boswell asked if anyone knew the distance of the overhang of the existing front porch. Ms. Nevins-Hawks commented that she felt it was properly represented on the drawing of the front elevation. Mr. Boswell commented the overhang of the existing front porch appeared to be 12” to 18” per the plans.

Ms. Nevins-Hawks shared that the homeowner expressed the underside of the stairs would have lattice, similar to the existing front porch, however it was not depicted in the drawings.
Mr. Weston moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness with the conditions that the distance of the proposed porch roof overhang match the distance of the existing front porch overhang and that the underside of the stairs be screened with lattice to match the existing front porch. Mr. Thaler seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Holman, Mr. Hord, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Nevins-Hawks, Mr. Scott, Mr. Thaler, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

_Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Porches & Steps, p. 6; Additions & Infill, p. 4; County Code, Sec 32-7-302_

**5.** Klinger Property, 719 Anneslie Road, Anneslie; Contributing structure in the Anneslie National Register Historic District; Part II approval for the in-kind replacement of approximately 30 slate roof tiles [County Council District # 5]

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

_Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Roofs, p. 9; County Code, Sec 11-2-201_

**6.** “Planters Paradise” and setting (Hoeing Property), 2316 Bauernschmidt Drive, Essex vicinity; Final Landmark # 110; MIHP # BA-263; Installation of a wood fence, gate, and pine arbor [County Council District # 7]

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

_Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Fences & Landscape, p. 4; County Code, Sec 32-7-403_

**7.** Kline Property, 308 Central Avenue, Glyndon; Contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District; MIHP # BA-796; Part II approval for a boiler replacement, installation of chimney liner, and asbestos remediation [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 11-2-201_

8. **“Butler House”**, 517 Bond Avenue, Glyndon; Final Landmark # 128; MIHP # BA-764; Modifications to a previously approved window style [County Council District # 2]

Ms. Rising explained the project, which was an amendment to a previously approved window style for the historic residence at 30 Greensborough Road, formerly 517 Bond Avenue, which was approved by the Commission October 17th, 2017. She elaborated that the 49 double hung sash windows were comprised of 21 replacement wood clad windows with double pane glass, 27 original all wood windows with single pane glass, and one vinyl replacement window. She continued that at the October 2017 meeting, it was believed the 21 replacement windows were all wood. However, the Pella representative informed the owners that the 21 replacement
windows were wood clad, not all wood, and that proposed replacement for the 27 original all wood windows would not match the existing 21 windows staying in place. Consequently, the applicants were seeking approval to amend the proposed replacement window style with a wood clad window that identically matched the wood clad windows staying in place.

Mr. Brennan acknowledged the owner, Mr. Michael Greenspun of Bond Property, LLC.

Mr. Greenspun gave background information on the property, which is a Victorian, three-level home that is being renovated as a community benefit for the Victoria Crossing PUD. He clarified that there was no all wood style window that would match the remaining wood clad windows, which was why he was seeking an amendment.

Mr. Brennan noted that the originally approved windows were Kolbe, however the proposed amendment was Pella windows. Mr. Greenspun stated his contractor preferred to work with Pella.

Mr. Boswell commented that he believed the cladding of the windows should have been mentioned in the application, and that it was important to apply correct terminology.

Mr. Boswell moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the amendment as proposed with the notation that the cladding material be specified. Ms. Nevins-Hawks seconded the motion. Mr. Hord questioned if the Commission should note the cladding type. Mr. Weston shared he believed it was a metal clad and Mr. Brennan confirmed. Ms. Rising informed the Commission that the cladding material was stated in the specifications sheet of the meeting materials and the Commission could reference that. Mr. Thaler commented that the motion should be amended to specify the approved cladding materials were those according to the Pella contract dated August 22nd, 2019 and presented to the Commission October 10th, 2019. Mr. Boswell accepted the amendment to the motion. Ms. Nevins-Hawks seconded the amended motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Holman, Mr. Hord, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Nevins-Hawks, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes. Mr. Thaler abstained from voting.

_Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Windows & Doors, p. 8; County Code, Sec 32-7-403_

9. Bair Property; 4607 Prospect Avenue, Glyndon; Non-contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District; Lowering of a 6’ wood privacy fence to 42”; relocating existing 6’ wood privacy fence by nine feet; installation of a 42” tall paddock fence between two shared driveways [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Rising introduced the agenda item, which included three separate proposals. The first proposal was for the lowering of a 6’ wood privacy fence to 42”; the second proposal was for the relocation of the wood privacy fence in nine feet so it was not encroaching on a neighboring property; the third proposal was for the installation of a 42” tall paddock fence between two conjoined driveways. Ms. Rising explained that the lowering and relocation of the existing wood privacy fence was submitted in response to a Final Order issued by the Office of Administrative
Hearings on August 19th, 2019 that denied the requests to retain the existing fence’s height and location. In regards to the third proposal, Ms. Rising shared that, upon the advice of the Office of Law, staff recommended the proposal be tabled pending the resolution of lot line issues outlined in the Final Order, as well as several outstanding code enforcement issues. Ms. Rising elaborated that the homeowner would not be able to obtain a permit until all outstanding issues with Code Enforcement had been reconciled.

Mr. Brennan recognized Mr. Steve Fradkin, the property owner of 4605 Prospect Avenue, Glyndon.

Mr. Fradkin remarked that he and his wife had no problem with the lowering and relocation of the 6’ wood privacy fence, as the fence was encroaching 7’ onto their property. He expressed he did not support the proposal for a new fence between the two connected driveways of 4607 and 4609 Prospect Avenue as it was not in continuity with the rest of the historic neighborhood. He elaborated he would like the person who completed Ms. Bair’s survey to come back to the property with him or members of the Commission present so it could be certain the fence was moved off his property.

Mr. Brennan recognized Mr. Tom Montanye and Ms. Kim Montanye, the property owners of 4609 Prospect Avenue, Glyndon.

Mr. Montanye shared that he had concerns with the 42” tall paddock style fence between the two conjoined driveways. He provided a survey he had completed, as well as a survey Ms. Bair had completed, which he stated showed the proposed location of the fence was on his property.

Mr. Brennan commented that this property boundary was under dispute.

Ms. Rising explained that staff, upon advice from the Office of Law, was recommending the new proposal be tabled because of outstanding code violations, an ongoing lot line dispute, and zoning compliance issues. She elaborated that Code Enforcement was responsible for overseeing that the work was conforming to the Final Order.

Mr. Thaler asked for clarification on what the lot line dispute was. Mr. Montanye explained that Ms. Bair’s driveway was encroaching on his property and that numerous surveys had confirmed this; consequently, the proposed location of the paddock style fence was also located on his property.

Mr. Thaler asked who completed the survey. Mr. Montanye stated that BPR Surveyors completed his survey.

Mr. Thaler asked if Ms. Bair disputed the results of Mr. Montanye’s survey. Mr. Montanye explained he had two separate surveys, both of which Ms. Bair disputed. He noted that Ms. Bair also had a survey, which he disputed.
Mr. Thaler clarified that if Ms. Bair built something on Mr. Montanye’s property it would be trespassing and the proper venue for resolution would be Circuit Court.

Ms. Montanye asked if anyone on the Commission was able to assist her and her husband with the property line dispute. Mr. Thaler confirmed that the Commission focused on historical aspects and consequently, issues related to surveys and titles were not within the purview of administrative agencies within Baltimore County Government; he reiterated the disputes would need to be resolved in Circuit Court. Mr. Thaler continued that he did not believe the Commission would ever knowingly approve a project on someone else’s property, but that it was not within the Commission purview to delve into property boundaries.

Ms. Rising noted that if the neighbors felt the work was not completed in accordance with the permits or the Final Order, they should contact Code Enforcement.

Mr. Boswell asked for clarification about the fence that projected beyond the front elevation of the home. Ms. Rising clarified that the fence was the new proposal between two conjoined driveways that staff has recommended be tabled.

Mr. Brennan asked if the property boundary between 4605 and 4607 Prospect Avenue was disputed. Ms. Rising responded that, based on discussions with the Office of Law regarding the Final Order, as well as discussions with Code Enforcement, she did not believe so and only the property boundary between 4607 and 4609 Prospect Avenue was disputed.

Mr. Brennan clarified that the Commission was okay to approve the lowering and relocation of the wood privacy fence since the lot line was not disputed. Ms. Rising confirmed this and stated that approving those proposals would allow Ms. Bair to be in accordance with the Final Order. Ms. Rising noted that Code Enforcement would be the agency to confirm the work was completed correctly.

Ms. Fradkin requested that the Commission specify someone from the survey company be present when relocating the fence to be sure it was moved off his property. He elaborated that he believed the stakes delineating his property line had been tampered with. Mr. Thaler stated that was not within the Commission’s purview, but that he believed moving property line stakes was illegal.

Ms. Rising clarified that if the fence was moved in conjunction with lot lines that had been tampered with, it would be reasonable to file a Code Enforcement complaint. The inspector would then need to go out and inspect the location based on the site plan provided with the permit, the Final Order, and the completed work; if work was not done as specified, it would be a code violation.

Mr. Thaler stated that you could not determine property boundaries based off the site plan supplied for a fence permit. Mr. Hord agreed. Ms. Rising confirmed that Code Enforcement would still need to be involved as complaints were tied to that agency.
Mr. Kellman provided that he did not believe any County Commission or body could approve any permit until all outstanding code violations were resolved. Ms. Rising confirmed this, and continued that the applicant had not yet applied for a permit. Ms. Rising noted that this was one of the reasons the Office of Law recommended the proposal be tabled.

Mr. Boswell moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the lowering of a 6’ wood privacy fence to 42”, to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the relocation of an existing 6’ wood privacy fence by nine feet, and to table the application for a new 42” tall paddock fence between two conjoined driveways due to outstanding lot line and code enforcement issues. Mr. Thaler seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Holman, Mr. Hord, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Nevins-Hawks, Mr. Scott, Mr. Thaler, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Porches & Steps, p. 6; Additions & Infill, p. 2; Office of Administrative Hearings, Final Order - August 19, 2019 - Case # 2019-0342-SPHA; County Code, Sec 32-7-403

10. Santoni’s Marketplace and Catering, 4854 Butler Road, Glyndon; Non-contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District; Installation of a vestibule to the front of the store; expansion of the loading dock [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Rising stated the address for the property and noted that it was a non-contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District, not a contributing structure as described on the preliminary agenda.

Ms. Bensley provided background on the project, which involved two additions to Santoni’s Marketplace and Catering. The first addition was an 8’ x 20’ vestibule at the entrance on the south side of the building. She continued that the vestibule was proposed to have automatic swing doors for entry, egress on both sides, and board and batten, trim, details, and coloring that all matched the existing façade. The second addition was an 8’ by 62’ enclosure of the loading dock area on the west side of the building. Ms. Bensley stated that the existing loading platform would be expanded approximately 34’ to meet the existing sidewalk grade, and six new overhead doors would be installed; the entire docking area will be enclosed. Additionally, she provided detail that the existing roofline would be extended to meet the new exterior wall, and all proposed materials, including the architectural asphalt shingle roof, board and batten, trim, details, and color, would match the existing façade.

Mr. Brennan recognized Mr. Lou Santoni, owner of Santoni’s Marketplace and Catering.

Mr. Brennan asked if Mr. Santoni owned the building. Mr. Santoni explained that he owned the business that occupied that portion of the building and that the building was owned by P. Fred Obrect Management Company. Mr. Santoni elaborated that he worked alongside the building owners with the proposal and that they would be doing the construction.

Mr. Brennan commented that the drawings were clear and consistent, and he felt the additions fit with the site.
Mr. Myer moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the additions as proposed. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Holman, Mr. Hord, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Nevins-Hawks, Mr. Scott, Mr. Thaler, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

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

11. “Randallstown Community Bank (Center), 9000 Liberty Road, Fieldstone; Final Landmark # 191; Contributing structure in the Fieldstone County Historic District; MIHP # BA-2903; Addition of a lobby; addition above an existing one-story portion of the building [County Council District # 4]

Ms. Rising introduced the item, which was an amended plan for alterations originally reviewed by the Commission September 12th, 2019. The updated plans included a 1,480 square foot lobby addition to the rear of the building, a 264 square foot addition above an existing one-story portion of the building, the installation of an enclosure for electric signage, and derelict window replacement. She further explained that no details were provided in regards to the sign enclosure or the window replacement. Ms. Rising informed the Commission that the September 11th, 2014 meeting minutes reflected that the windows were character defining features, and that the second floor windows had been recently scraped and repainted; any deterioration that had occurred since then, which prompted the proposed replacement, would need to be addressed as a separate issue. Additionally, Ms. Rising noted that all elevations of a historic building, contributing or non-contributing, were subject to review, and that the proposed addition would not be easily reversible, should a future owner wish to remove the addition.

Mr. Brennan recognized Mr. Robert Charles and Mr. Mark Levin, both of Levin Brown Architects.

Mr. Thaler questioned if the architects had adjusted the plans following the Commission suggestions at the September 12th, 2019 meeting. Mr. Levin confirmed that changes had been made.

Mr. Charles and Mr. Levin delivered a presentation highlighting the modifications made following staffs suggestions. Ms. Rising clarified that the suggestions came from the Commission, not from staff. Mr. Charles explained that the addition above the warming kitchen had been pushed back to preserve one of the windows on the second floor of the building, and that the addition had a window that replicated those on the Liberty Road façade of the building.

Mr. Brennan asked what the materials of the addition were, and confirmed it was what the Commission reviewed last month. Mr. Levin replied it was different than what had previously been reviewed, as it was a different color. Mr. Charles stated it was Trespa. Ms. Rising confirmed it was the plastic material as previously reviewed. Mr. Charles explained it was a multi-colored arrangement and that the Trespa material was a high-pressure, compact,
laminate panel, reinforced with wood-based fibers. He explained that a multi-colored arrangement was chosen to better compliment the random ashlar stone of the building.

Mr. Charles explained that the fenestration of the existing windows was a narrow band on the bottom, a wide band in the middle, and a narrow band at the top. Because of this, the fenestration of the glass for the rear lobby addition was adjusted to match the pattern. He then provided detail that the color palette had been adjusted to better compliment the colors of the random ashlar stone.

Mr. Charles presented a photo of the Randallstown Elementary School, located at 9013 Liberty Road, and explained how it had rust colored framing similar to what was proposed, and was across the street. Ms. Rising noted that it was not in within the bounds of the Fieldstone County Historic District or a Final Landmark. Mr. Charles stated he was looking at the community at large.

Mr. Brennan clarified Mr. Charles was referring the color of the window system. Mr. Levin confirmed he was. Mr. Charles explained that the Trespa color proposed for the addition was not inconsistent for the area.

Mr. Levin stated that the building appeared gray in renderings, but was actually quite varied because of the random ashlar stone; providing a range of Trespa colors would pick up on the variation.

Mr. Brennan asked if anyone on the Commission had experience working with Trespa. Mr. Hord offered he had. Mr. Brennan questioned if it was plastic. Mr. Hord confirmed it was. Ms. Nevins-Hawks advised it was durable and a through-body product, meaning it would maintain its color even if scratched. Mr. Brennan questioned if it was an appropriate material in this application. Ms. Nevins-Hawks stated she believed it was.

Mr. Boswell explained that he felt the Trespa cube-like portion of the addition on page 15 of the provided plans appeared very jarring in juxtaposition with the current buildings masonry structure. Mr. Brennan agreed and noted that bringing the corners of the cube-like portion to the ground may improve the design.

Mr. Brennan remarked that the addition was very prominent and did not preserve a significant portion of the original building. Additionally, he explained he felt the curve of the rear lobby addition was a gratuitous element. Mr. Levin responded the curve responded to the rear of the pocket park located adjacent to the site.

Mr. Hord expressed he felt the plans were moving in the correct directions and that the architects had addressed the suggestions the Commission made at the September 12th, 2019 meeting.

Mr. Diggs shared that he liked the addition.
Ms. McIver questioned why the applicants proposed such a strong color, especially for the warming kitchen. Mr. Levin explained they modeled the colors off the existing random ashlar stone.

Mr. Levin explained that people driving by would only see a sliver of the curve of the glass lobby, and only those entering the building would see the extent of the addition.

Mr. Hord stated the colors of the Trespa were picking up on the colors of the stone.

Ms. McIver commented she felt the addition was better than the original proposal, but that it could stand to be a bit more stubble. Mr. Levin stated art was subjective.

Mr. Weston asked if the Commission was voting on the electrified sign even though no additional information was provided and it was not on the renderings. Mr. Charles stated that the sign was shown on the two-dimensional drawings provided but not the renderings; he continued that it was a minor component and could likely be tabled.

Mr. Charles stated that Levin Brown Architects had received feedback from the community, the County Councilman, the Liberty Road Business Association, Fieldstone, and state representatives; the feedback was supportive of the modern feel of the addition and expressed that it made the site stand out. Consequently, Mr. Charles advised making the design more subtle would lessen the emphasis of the addition.

Mr. Levin asked if he could elaborate on the signage. Mr. Brennan asked Ms. Rising if the Commission should vote on the proposal. Ms. Rising explained there was not enough information about the signage, therefore staff did not feel comfortable making a recommendation. Mr. Kellman asked if it was free-standing. Mr. Levin confirmed it was. Mr. Kellman asked if it was changeable copy. Mr. Levin replied it would depend what was permitted for the area. Mr. Brennan clarified the Commission would not vote on the sign.

Mr. Brennan provided he believed the addition should be dialed back a bit. He offered suggestions that the Trespa cube-like portion at the rear of the building be adjusted to better flow, that the side addition be better integrated with the existing one-story portion beneath it, and that it would be ideal to preserve a second window on the side façade of the building where the warming kitchen was proposed. Mr. Levin stated they could not push the warming kitchen addition back any further without losing the functionality.

Mr. Brennan asked the material of the band on the glass of the windows and confirmed it was a different color from the rest of the addition. Mr. Levin stated it was proposed to be clear, but he felt the color should be adjusted to a champagne color to better compliment the addition.

Mr. Thaler asked Mr. Brennan’s feelings on the color of the warming kitchen. Mr. Brennan shared he felt it was a bit distracting and could be better integrated. Mr. Boswell stated he did not have a significant concern with the color, but was concerned with the massing of the rear
addition. Mr. Hord expressed he was okay with the colors, as it made the distinction that it was a new addition.

Mr. Weston agreed with Mr. Brennan about the massing of the side addition, and noted that the proportions of the window on the warming kitchen did not match the proportions of any of the existing windows.

Ms. Nevins-Hawks stated she felt the addition was appropriate and she enjoyed the modern look of it. She agreed that the columns from the cube-like portion of the rear addition needed to be adjusted.

Mr. Thaler asked if the Commission was close enough to vote on the addition and if the Commission could form a working group to advise the applicants. Ms. Rising stated that the Commission had brought up numerous modifications, which made it difficult for staff to approve a final plan at the time of permit. She elaborated she felt additional review from the Commission as an entity would be helpful.

Mr. Thaler reiterated the applicants should form a working group with the architects of the Commission.

Mr. Scott explained his opinion of the project would change drastically if the pocket park at the corner of Liberty and McDonough Roads was not there. Mr. Thaler noted it was a Baltimore County public park. Mr. Scott observed the addition will look quite different in the winter when the trees at the park were not full and screening the building.

Mr. Hord suggested the Commission should make a motion outlining the discussed comments.

Mr. Brennan recognized Ms. Anne Gryczon, the Executive Director of the Preservation Alliance of Baltimore County.

Ms. Gryczon advised that Preservation Alliance felt the addition should be done in a way that the historic building stays intact and the addition can be removed in the future.

Mr. Weston observed that the plans called for the removal of 16’ to 20’ of the rear wall for the lobby addition. Mr. Charles commented that was something the architects has considered.

Ms. Rising noted that she felt it would be appropriate for a Technical Committee to work with the architects, but that the Commission should not delegate the responsibility of approving the plans on behalf of the Commission as too many modifications had been outlined. Mr. Hord agreed that comments should be given and that the plans should be reviewed by the Commission at a later date.

Mr. Boswell asked to further discuss the removal of the existing stone wall. Mr. Levin confirmed it was approximately 20’ in total, but there were two existing windows. He elaborated that they could modify the plans to remove less.
Ms. Rising reminded the Commission that they still needed to make a motion to not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or a Notice to Proceed if they were not approving the application presented to them. She further explained that the Commission should outline the modifications in any motion.

Mr. Thaler asked why the Commission had to vote to not approve the plans. Ms. Rising replied that the Commission was required to act in accordance with Title 7 of the Baltimore County Code, which indicated they must vote on an application once it has been deemed complete.

Mr. Thaler moved to not issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or a Notice to Proceed, but invited the applicants to come back with modifications. Ms. Nevins-Hawks stated the modification of adjusting the columns below the Trespa cube on the rear of the building to be more consistent with the proportions of the addition. She elaborated that possible adjustments included the cube could be stretched to the ground, or the columns could be pushed back to the wall to not be as prominent. Mr. Hord stated the modification of removing less of the existing stone building from the second floor. Ms. Nevins-Hawks stated the modification of adjusting the proportions of the warming kitchen window to better replicate the windows on the Liberty Road façade of the building. Mr. Brennan stated the modifications of providing a lighter range of Trespa colors for the whole addition and the modification of better integrating the warming kitchen to the stone below it. Mr. Holman seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Holman, Mr. Hord, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer, Ms. Nevins-Hawks, Mr. Scott, Mr. Thaler, and Mr. Weston. There were no dissenting votes.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Additions & Infill, pp. 1-7; National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, Preservation Brief # 14 - New Exterior Additions to Historic Buildings: Preservation Concerns; Fieldstone Historic District Design Guidelines – Adopted November 13, 2003; County Code, Sec 32-7-403

Other Business

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

Nass-Teret Property, 323 Hopkins Road, Rodgers Forge; MHT approval for an in-kind asphalt shingle roof replacement. [County Council District # 5]

Kysiak Property, 406 Dunkirk Road, Rodgers Forge; MHT approval for an amended scope of work for the installation of a fireplace and chimney liner. [County Council District # 5]

“Willow Glen” (van den Beemt Property), 16616 Remare Road, Monkton; MHT approval for the in-kind replacement of a boiler. [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Rising stated that the 2020 meeting schedule was now available. She noted that the April date was changed due to Passover.
Mr. Diggs announced he was stepping down from the Commission and this was his last meeting. He expressed his gratitude for the Commission members and staff. Members of the Commission thanked him for his preservation efforts.

Mr. Thaler acknowledged Mr. Hord’s retirement from the practice of architecture.

Mr. Thaler reminded the Commission and citizens that meetings are recorded and public information. He cited a legal suit a Commission member was involved in.

Mr. Brennan stated that the 6th annual Doors Open Baltimore was a success with tours of 57 unique buildings and sites in Baltimore City; he invited anyone interested to attend next year’s event.

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

The meeting adjourned at 7:48 PM.

TAB:tab