

Minutes
Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission
October 8, 2009 Meeting

Mr. Bruce Boswell, Vice Chairman, opened the regular monthly meeting of the Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) at 6:03 p.m. The following Commission members were:

<u>Present</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
Mr. C. Bruce Boswell, Vice Chairman	Mr. John W. Hill, Chairman
Ms. Carol Allen	Ms. Nancy M. Hubers
Mr. Robert P. Brennan	Ms. Gloria McJilton
Mr. David Bryan	Mr. Thomas J. Reynolds
Mr. Louis S. Diggs	
Mr. Dean C. Hoover	
Ms. Nancy W. Horst	
Ms. Wendy McIver	
Ms. Norma Secoura	
Mr. Qutub K. Syed	

County staff present included, Karin Brown (Chief for Preservation Services), Teri Rising (Preservation Services staff) and Vicki Nevy (Secretary to the Commission).

The official meeting was preceded by a special presentation honoring Jim Matthews, the previous chairman and longtime member of the LPC. Mr. Boswell read a Resolution commending Mr. Matthews for his years of service and dedication to the cause of preservation.

Review of the Agenda

1. Ms. Brown advised the Commission that the changes to the Preliminary Agenda involved the addition of an alteration to a property in a County Historic District, a tax credit project and a change in the order nominations were being heard.

Approval of the Minutes

2. Mr. Boswell asked if anyone had any changes to make to the September 10, 2009 Minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Diggs moved to approve the September 10, 2009 Minutes. Ms. McIver seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Consent Agenda

3. Mr. Boswell asked Ms. Brown to describe the items scheduled on the Consent Agenda. Mr. Boswell noted that no one had signed up to speak with regard to any of the consent agenda items. Mr. Brennan requested that item 12 be pulled from the Consent Agenda to allow discussion about his experience with a similar project that was being disapproved of by the State Rehabilitation Tax Credit program. Mr. Syed moved that, for the reasons stated, and in accordance with the conditions stated in the written Action Summaries provided to the members of the Commission by staff, items 7, 8, 10, 14 and 15 be approved as submitted. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Public Hearing on Nomination to the Preliminary Landmarks List

4. Gorsuch Tavern, tavern and setting, 15911 York Road, Sparks; County Inventory # CI-130 (MIHP #BA-130) [County Council District # 3]

This item concerned a third party nomination to the Landmarks List.

Ms. Rising offered a short presentation of the history of the property and read staff's recommendation to place the Gorsuch Tavern on the Preliminary Landmarks List and to delineate the setting. She pointed out that the Gorsuch Tavern was already listed on the National Register of Historic Places and the National Park Service Network to Freedom Trail.

Mr. Boswell determined there was no one present who had signed up to speak.

Ms. Secoura suggested adding criteria (5) – it has yielded or may be likely to yield information or materials important in pre-history or history to the reasons justifying the nomination. Ms. Rising pointed out staff did not make that recommendation because neither the National Park Service nor Maryland Historical Trust had designated the site as having archeological potential.

Ms. Secoura moved to vote to (a) place the “Gorsuch Tavern” on the Preliminary Landmarks List under criteria (1) –for its association with the Christiana Riot of 1851; for its association with the historically significant Gorsuch family; for its association with the history of the area of Sparks; for its association with the National Park Service Network to Freedom Trail (2) - as an excellent example of early 19th century architecture with its distinctive porches that has retained its historic integrity and (3) - as an excellent example of the work of a early 19th century master builder (b) to delineate the property, 1.6 acres total, (map 28, parcel 223) as its historic environmental setting. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

5. Gorsuch Barn, barn and setting, 15900 York Road, Sparks; County Inventory # CI-129, (MIHP #BA-129) [County Council District # 3]

This item concerned a third party nomination to the Landmarks List.

Ms. Rising provided a summary of the property's history and read staff's recommendation to place the structure on the Preliminary Landmarks List.

The attorney for the corporation owning the property, Mr. Daniel J. Hanley, stated that the Gorsuch Barn is part of the Estate of Emma Mosner Carroll who died in January of 2009. Mr. Hanley explained the barn had been significantly altered over the years, including the addition of brick to the front façade, installation of the commercial store windows, a chimney, a rear deck, aluminum siding, roof replacement, vinyl clad windows, and alterations to the end walls. He explained that Ms. Carroll's will provides for approximately 2 acres surrounding the barn to be given to the owners of the antique shop. He feared they might not take the parcel if the barn is placed on the Final Landmarks List and an historic environmental setting is delineated. His clients are concerned about the future viability of the property should it be landmarked.

Ms. Ruth Mascari, representing herself as a board member of the Baltimore County Historic Trust, stated that the barn is a good adaptive reuse of an historic building. She considered the adaptation of the barn's front entrance to the current commercial storefront fitting, noting that the building is still recognizable as a barn in spite of the many alterations.

Mr. Diggs stated he had been to the site and could not imagine what it may have looked like as a barn. He asked whether the other structures on the property might have been slave quarters. Ms. Rising explained slave quarters typically were wooden structures and the corncrib had been built on the foundation of a barn and the other structure is clearly a springhouse. Mr. Boswell commented that the structures on the property were typical of a German style farm.

Ms. Horst agreed with Ms. Mascari that the barn was a wonderful example of adaptive reuse and that it has served as a landmark along York Road over the years. She asked whether this site had been evaluated for its archeological potential. Ms. Rising explained a study of the area had been completed in 2000 as part of a view shed project and no archeological sites had been designated at that time.

Mr. Hanley asked that consideration be given to the future use of the large parcel of land surrounding the barn. Access to that site traverses the parcel the barn is located on. Mr. Boswell reported that he and Ms. Secoura had walked over a portion of the parcel to view a tenant house which had burned and been rebuilt in the 1920's. Ms. Secoura and he initially felt that the tenant house should be included in the historic environmental setting. However, in consideration of the

information provided about the subdivision he would be supportive of limiting the setting to a smaller, 2.6337 acre portion of the parcel (map 28, parcel 110) as outlined in purple on a Boundary Survey completed by Gerhold, Cross & Etzel, Ltd. dated November 30, 2001.

Ms. McIver moved to accept staff's recommendation and to vote to (a) place the "Gorsuch Stone Barn" on the Preliminary Landmarks List under criteria (1) –for its association with the historically significant Gorsuch family and their Retreat Farm complex; for its association with Edward Gorsuch and the Christiana Riot of 1851; for its association with the agricultural history of Baltimore County; for its association with the 19th and 20th century history of the area of Sparks; and as an important artifact that represents agricultural history in Baltimore County (2) - as a distinctive and significant example of barn architecture that features the notable ventilator pattern of a wheat sheaf design (3) - as an excellent example of a master builder in the design and construction of the building and its 20th century adaptive reuse (b) to delineate 2.6337 acres (map 28, parcel 110) as its historic environmental setting. Mr. Syed seconded the motion, which passed with the only dissenting vote cast by Mr. Diggs.

6. Brookvale (Rognley House), house, tenant house, spring house, ice house, office, shed, barn, blacksmith shop, gas pump and setting, 14943 York Road, Sparks; County Inventory # CI-431 (MIHP #BA-431) [County Council District #3]

This item concerned a third party nomination to the Landmarks List.

Ms. Rising provided a summary of the property's history and read staff's recommendation to vote to place the Brookvale house, the tenant house, spring house, ice house, office, shed, barn, blacksmith shop, gas pump and setting on the Preliminary Landmarks List.

Ms. Kathryn Bishop, Chairman of the Baltimore County Historic Trust, stated the property was important to the entire Sparks area and to the Quaker community originally located to the south. She said the store had serviced the Quaker community and further mentioned the interior of the store is remarkable in that it still lacks plumbing and an electrical system.

After having determined no one else in the audience wished to speak, Mr. Boswell called for a motion. Mr. Diggs moved to (a) place "Brookvale" House, Tenant House, Blacksmith's Shop, Barn, Shed, Spring House, Ice House, Office Building, & Gas Pump on the Preliminary Landmarks List under criteria (1) –for its association with the historically significant Matthews and Brooks families; as a collection of buildings that are associated with the evolution of several different trades including blacksmithing and the funeral trades; for its association with the town of Philopolis and Sparks (2) - as a group of buildings that are distinctive examples of various period styles of construction that retain an excellent level of historic integrity (3) - as an excellent example of a work of a master builder in the

design and construction of the buildings (b) to delineate the property, 10 acres total, (map 34, parcel 54) as its historic environmental setting. Ms. McIver seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Alteration to properties in County Historic Districts or Landmark structures

- **7. Sorock property, 312 Central Avenue; “Cockey House”; County Inventory # CI-797 (MIHP # BA-797) contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District, repair of existing front porch roof, gutter, fascia, drip edge and shingles [County Council District # 3]

Approved via the consent agenda to issue Certificate of Appropriateness.

- **8. Torsell House, 79 Winters Lane, FLL # 344, contributing structure in the Winters Lane National Register District; County Inventory # CI-3262 (MIHP # BA-3262); routine maintenance/repair of the windows, doors, cedar shakes, exterior painting [County Council District # 1]

Approved via the consent agenda to issue Certificate of Appropriateness.

9. 5109 South Rolling Road, non-contributing structure in the Relay County Historic District; request to apply gingerbread design to panels below the windows [County Council District # 1]

Ms. Brown explained this project was brought to the Commission a few years ago as a request to construct a new home. At the time, a major part of the discussion revolved around where to place the home on the site and the scale of the project. After working with the homeowners and neighbors, a mutually agreeable site and scale was agreed upon and the project was approved, except for the application of gingerbread ornamentation on panels at the front facade of the home. The owners are now asking that the restriction be lifted and that they be permitted to apply the gingerbread design to these panels. Ms. Brown noted that she received an email from the local advisory committee stating they supported the request to add the gingerbread ornamentation. The advisory group felt that the homeowners had initially made significant concessions regarding the placement and scale of the dwelling and that the panels were in need of adornment. (Note: The Relay Historic Advisory Group no longer provides recommendations, the above e-mail was an unofficial comment regarding the above request.)

Mr. Boswell determined that no one present had signed up to speak. He explained that in order to assess the issue properly, he had requested to view the plans for the house that were originally approved by the LPC. He noticed a number of discrepancies between the approved plan and the building in question.

Mr. Brennan stated that what was built was clearly not what was presented in the drawings. He also understood and appreciated the local advisory groups reasoning and support for the addition of gingerbread on the panels.

Mr. Boswell suggested the possibility of eliminating the panels and continuing the siding in their place, or making the panels smaller to reflect the approved design. Mr. Bryan suggested approving the gingerbread ornamentation provided the second floor front elevation was brought in compliance with the approved plan. Mr. Diggs did not object to approving the additional gingerbread and Ms. Secoura suggested issuing a Notice to Proceed rather than a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Diggs moved to issue a Notice to Proceed with the addition of gingerbread to the panels. Ms. Allen seconded the motion, which failed with Mr. Hoover, Mr. Brennan, Ms. Allen, Mr. Bryan, Mr. Diggs and Ms. Secoura voting in the affirmative.

Mr. Bryan moved to issue a Notice to Proceed for the request to add gingerbread to the panels provided the 2nd floor front façade of the house was being returned to the design that was originally approved. Mr. Boswell seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

- **10. Burgess property, 324 & 326 Central Avenue; “Welsh House”, County Inventory # CI-793 (MIHP # BA-793) contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District, ordinary maintenance – repaint/repair of siding, trim, windows/doors/shutters [County Council District # 3]

Approved via the consent agenda to issue Certificate of Appropriateness.

10. Adler property, 506 Sudbrook Lane; “Clarence Reynolds House”, County Inventory # CI-3025 (MIHP # BA-3025) contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District; ex post facto approval for the replacement of existing non-historic windows in an enclosed non-historic rear sunroom; installation of French doors and transoms and approval for a rear yard deck [County Council District # 2]

Ms. Brown explained that in response to an unauthorized rear yard renovation of a non-historic rear yard sunroom, the County issued a stop work order. Ms. Brown noted that Sudbrook Park, Inc., Landmarks Committee (SPLC) had written a letter, which recommended against approving the project as existing and that SPLC was also opposed to permitting the construction of the deck as proposed. She stated that because the alteration concerned a non-historic portion of the dwelling and because it was on a secondary façade, which was not visible from the street, staff’s recommendation was to issue a Notice to Proceed. Staff also recommended approving the construction of the deck, because it was reversible.

Ms. Tracey King, attorney for the homeowners, explained that the owners thought since they were not making changes to the historic fabric the project did not need LPC review. Mr. Adler apologized for not having brought the project to the LPC initially. He explained that they also would like to build a deck in the rear of the home to allow his elderly parents to access the outdoors from the sunroom without having to deal with steps. They choose to install transoms for optimal light and casements windows have been installed on other homes in the community. Mrs. Adler pointed out that each window on the rear of the home is unique and there are historic transom windows elsewhere on the house.

Mr. Bryan asked if the Adlers had ever brought a project before the LPC before and Mr. Brennan questioned if they had pulled a standard county permit for the work. Mr. Adler said he had a project involving a patio before the LPC several years ago and did pull a permit for the subject project after the stop work order was issued.

Mr. Michael Soitir addressed the Commission on behalf of SPLC. He informed the Commission that the local advisory committee has met almost every month for the past 15 years and their mission is to work with residents wishing to make exterior changes to their homes. They reviewed the plans the Adlers had submitted and they recommend several changes to those plans. Instead of the casement windows, they prefer the use of double-hung windows with 6 over 6 true divided lights or simulated true divided lights. The advisory committee felt the siding should be either cedar shake or a wood or composite concrete clapboard. They did not comment on the doors or sides of the addition because they felt they did not have adequate plans and pictures submitted to them for review at the time. They also felt the transoms were not compatible with the existing rear façade of the home and should be covered up. As for the rear deck being proposed, they did not support the project because it was to be too large and would not be in keeping with the historic character of the community. SPLC suggested constructing a patio that would be accessible via a flight of steps.

Mr. Diggs asked how the community notifies the residents about the requirement for project review and Mr. Soitir explained the community organization published a quarterly newsletter, which addresses the process.

Mr. Boswell asked if the homeowners and the local advisory committee had tried to work out a compromise. Mr. Adler said they would agree to using the mullions suggested and would reduce the size of the deck to 20'x 24' with one step down to the deck surface. Mr. Boswell also explained he had visited the site. He noted that one of the sides of the sunroom is visible from the street and the window was protruding from the facade. He suggested that this particular window be replaced with a window resembling the historic windows along that façade, namely a 6 over 6, true divided light window.

Mr. Soitir commented that using casement windows makes no sense on a historic property. Mr. Boswell explained a homeowner could not be required to replace non-historic materials with more historically appropriate materials.

Mr. Boswell moved to issue a Notice to Proceed with the exception that the rear right (south-west) window be replaced with a window that matches the existing fenestration on that façade in dimension and height. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion.

Mr. Brennan stated he agrees with the local advisory committee on all points and appreciated them sending a representative to the meeting. He explained he was bothered by the fact that the homeowner had lived in the community for so many years and did not understand the rules for submitting a project for review prior to commencing with the work. Mr. Bryan agreed.

Mr. Boswell called for a vote on the motion to issue a Notice to Proceed. The motion failed with all present voting in the negative except for Mr. Boswell and Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Brennan moved to require the homeowners to continue working with the local advisory committee towards a mutually agreeable plan for the project. Mr. Bryan seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Applications for Tax Credit

Request for LPC approval for County Part II Tax Credit application

12. Enoch property, 1613 Kurtz Avenue, Lutherville County Historic District; application of foam insulation [County Council District # 3]

Mr. Brennan reported he is working on a tax credit project in Glyndon involving the application of the same type of foam insulation. The State has not approved the use of foam insulation for that project because of the potential for moisture collection. The State prefers using blown-in insulation, because moisture collection is not as much a factor as it would be with foam insulation. Mr. Boswell explained the blown-in insulation uses an open cell product whereas the foam insulation is a closed cell product.

Mr. Brennan moved to approve the application of foam insulation provided its application is consistent with how the State would address the subject. Mr. Boswell seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

13. Vetock property, 5129 S. Rolling Road, Relay County Historic District; replacement of non-historic existing front door, transom and sidelights [County Council District # 1]

Ms. Brown noted this project involved the replacement of an existing non-historic front door that had a transom and sidelights. Although there were no pictures to show the original entrance, the homeowners did provide pictures of other properties in the District showing front doors and transoms similar to what they were proposing.

Mr. Boswell commented the replacement door and transom would be appropriate for the home. Mr. Diggs moved to vote to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Bryan seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

- **14. Schaffer property, 716 Howard Road; Sudbrook Park County Historic District; replacement of a non-original metal-framed garden window with two wood casement windows [County Council District # 2]

Approved via the consent agenda to issue Certificate of Appropriateness.

- **15. Drake property, 800 Hatherleigh Road, Stoneleigh National Register District, garage roof replacement with in-kind materials [County Council District # 5]

Approved via the consent agenda to issue Certificate of Appropriateness.

Other Business

Prior to the conclusion of the meeting, Ms. Brown reminded the commissioners that the Fall Retreat was scheduled for October 29, 2009 at Emory Grove Hotel in Glyndon.

Ms. Allen moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Horst seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously on a voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

VKN:vkn