

DRAFT

**Minutes
Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission
October 13, 2011 Meeting**

Mr. Bruce Boswell, Chairman, opened the regular monthly meeting of the Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) at 6:05 p.m. The following Commission members were:

Present

Mr. C. Bruce Boswell, Chairman
Ms. Carol Allen, Vice Chairman
Mr. Robert P. Brennan
Mr. David Bryan
Mr. Louis S. Diggs
Ms. Barbara Eckley
Mr. John W. Hill
Ms. Nancy W. Horst
Ms. Wendy McIver
Mr. Qutub U. K. Syed

Not Present

Mr. John E. Day
Mr. Carl F. Herb|
Ms. Gloria McJilton
Mr. Howard Perlow
Mr. Thomas J. Reynolds

Attending County staff included Jeff Mayhew (Deputy Director, Office of Planning), Karin Brown (Chief, Preservation Services) and Teri Rising (Preservation Services staff).

Review of the Agenda

1. There were no changes to the Preliminary Agenda.

Approval of the Minutes

2. Mr. Boswell asked if anyone proposed changes to the September 8, 2011 Minutes. Mr. Boswell noted one error in need of correction. Mr. Boswell indicated that his comments on the project in Ruxton incorrectly stated that he said standard windows when in fact he said double hung windows. He asked that the minutes be changed to reflect his comments. Mr. Hill moved to approve the September 8, 2011 Minutes subject to the correction. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Alteration to properties in County Historic Districts or Landmark structures

4. Wellman property, 5112 South Rolling Road, MIHP # BA-2384, contributing structure in the Relay County Historic District; alterations to an existing non-historic rear addition [County Council District # 1]

Ms. Brown indicated that this project was actually a tax credit application already approved by the State. The application also involved an addition in the rear. There are two staircases in the open that look unattractive and the proposal is to replace them with an enclosed staircase. Because the State already approved the tax credit, staff is permitted to approve the application so the LPC will not have to review it. She further explained that the only feature that the LPC would have to review is whether removing the previous stairs and creating a new staircase would be appropriate. Staff recommends issuing a certificate of appropriateness. Mr. Boswell noted that if the Commission finds that the addition is not appropriate it could jeopardize the tax credits from the County but would not affect the State tax credits.

Mr. Howard Wellman, owner of the property, presented background information about the proposal and additional details relating to the rationale behind the plans. Neil Junker, who prepared the tax credit application, accompanied him. Mr. Wellman confirmed staff's representation of the issues and reiterated that there were old stairs in the rear of the house that were unsightly and potentially presented a safety issue. He indicated that he and his wife wanted to remove the stairs and extend the existing addition to enclose a new staircase. Mr. Boswell asked whether or not the previous owners had built the stairs for a second floor unit. Mr. Wellman explained that the previous owners had put a bedroom up in the third floor in the attic and had built the stairway on top of a 1980's addition to access the attic room from the outside so that there would be two ways to access the room. He indicated that they still wanted to have dual entrances to the room so they needed to make the stairs safe. Mr. Boswell confirmed that the interior staircase to the third floor still existed and that the house was now being used as a single-family dwelling. Mr. Wellman explained that the room was not presently being used but that they had considered utilizing it as a nanny or in-law suite. Mr. Boswell questioned whether or not they had considered eliminating the additional staircase altogether but Mr. Wellman said that he was under the impression that there needed to be two forms of egress from the space. Mr. Boswell responded that it was not necessary since it was an attic third floor space and a single-family residence. Mr. Wellman stated they would like to have multiple accesses to the room, because it would be convenient to have a private entrance available should they hire a nanny. Mr. Boswell inquired whether the doorway, shown on the lower right hand corner of the Linden Road side elevation of the house, was the private entrance leading directly to the third floor. Mr. Wellman responded the door opened to a space that would either lead to stairs to the third floor or a door

that would take one to the rear of the kitchen on the ground floor. Mr. Boswell indicated that from a design perspective the door, as shown, is wedged into the corner of the addition. He thought that aesthetically it would look better if it were not so tight to that corner. Mr. Wellman explained that the door placement was caused by the need to comply with the Secretary's Standards. The Standards did not allow them to disturb the existing stairway that leads down from the deck of the side porch. They had to squeeze the door into the location shown, to allow for adequate space between the two sets of steps. A person using the rear staircase would have to come down the steps, turn right and go back up the existing stairs on to the porch. They were not permitted to go straight out on to a landing. Mr. Boswell asked for some clarification regarding the setbacks of the porch and the proposed new addition. Mr. Wellman indicated the proposal was following the footprint of the current addition.

Members of the Commission examined the site plan included with the application to determine the distance between the proposed stairs and the porch. Mr. Hill indicated that based on the drawing it would seem that the new door would require a small landing, which might infringe on the smaller stairway that comes down from the existing porch. Some members of the Commission were concerned that the configuration would not work. Mr. Wellman shared the architect's plans and provided additional details about the position of the stairs and door. Mr. Boswell asked if a window could be moved to the left on the first floor and another one be added above it, on the second floor. Ms. Brown pointed out that because the State had already approved the proposal as shown, if the LPC requested changes to the design, Mr. Wellman would have to go back the State to have them approved. Mr. Junker added that the suggested changes would be inconsistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, which asked for a clear differentiation between what is old and new. He further explained that by putting the windows where suggested, it would misrepresent history and make it look original to the house. Mr. Hill indicated that it was a judgment call and wondered how the State was in the business of approving the design of the addition. Ms. Brown clarified that a tax credit applicant would have to show all proposed changes to the State; an applicant could not present a rehabilitation project and then later build an addition because the addition might have a negative impact on the integrity of the historic structure. She explained that the County's standard procedure is, that if the State approves an application, staff can sign off. Staff brought the matter before the Commission only because it involved an addition. Mr. Boswell asked Mr. Junker how the process would be affected if the fenestration of the doorway were changed. Mr. Junker responded that new architectural drawings would need to be prepared and that it would need to be re-sent to the Maryland Historical Trust, which might take 60 to 90 days, but he could not give a specific time table. Mr. Hill indicated that although the project was approved by the State it may be impractical to implement because of the space issues and that there could be safety issues. Mr. Junker said that an architect with the Trust had reviewed the project to see that it met the Standards. He also said that it was likely they did not scrutinize the measurements of the

stairs. Mr. Bryant asked if the LPC's concern was focused on the door/step locations that were based primarily on the homeowner's convenience and possibly safety, if the homeowner was satisfied with the issues he was not sure it should be a matter with which the Commission should be concerned. Mr. Boswell explained that the Commission's discussion about aesthetic and safety issues was out of concern that Mr. Wellman might not be getting the best end product and not a comment on the overall quality of the project. Mr. Junker indicated that if they find out there is an issue with the measurements, they would be required to amend the application with the Trust and they would also send the revisions to Preservation Services. Mr. Syed stated that the construction would have to be done in compliance with national building codes and that based on his examination and experience, the proposal, as presented, would not pass code requirements because of the tread of the steps. He added that he did not believe the State would have the authority to change the building code. Mr. Wellman asked Mr. Syed to show him which tread he was concerned about. He then clarified for Mr. Syed that the tread belonged to the existing interior stairway in the main hall and pointed out that the discussion was focused on the exterior stairway. Mr. Syed stated that the exterior stairway would also not comply with code but that they would see that when it was time to apply for a building permit.

Mr. Hill made a motion to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Syed seconded the motion, which was passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Applications for Tax Credit

5. Kokemor property, 800 Ridgeleigh Road, Stoneleigh National Register District; repair of house and garage slate roof, repair brick chimney and brace garage walls [Council District #5]

Approved via the consent agenda to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

6. "Belle Grove", 12 Hillview Drive, Catonsville, MIHP #BA2744, Final Landmarks List #151; Delineate the entire 1,01 Acre property as the Historic Environmental Setting (HES); heating/cooling system installation and electrical system update [Council District #1]

Approved via the consent agenda to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

7. Wagandt LLC property, 781 Oella Avenue, Oella National Register District; complete rehabilitation of the structure [Council District #1]

Ms. Brown presented the details about the project, which many of the Commission members had already seen on a site visit. She stated that this application was for a commercial tax credit because it is an income producing property. The applicant had started the work and realizing that the project was

much more complex and expensive than initially envisioned asked for an approval of a tax credit application for the remainder of the work. Quite a few Commission members visited the site to determine if any historic materials had been removed or destroyed and the determination was made that it had not. Ms. Brown noted staff's recommendation to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Hill moved to vote to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Report on County Tax Credit applications approved

The following historic property tax credit applications were approved by staff due to the receipt of Part II approval for work reviewed by MHT:

Baldanza property, 219 Melancthon Avenue, MIHP #BA67, contributing structure in the Lutherville National Register District and the Lutherville County Historic District; existing PVC downspouts to be replaced with round copper downspouts, repair/replacement of gutter system, in-kind replacement of the front porch roof and front bay roof, in-kind replacement of copper valleys of upper main roof, dormer roofs to be cleaned and repainted, existing water heaters to be replaced, and repair of plaster damaged by roof leaks [County Council District #3]

Wellman property, 5112 S. Rolling Road, MIHP #BA2384, contributing structure in the Relay County Historic District; installation of heating/air conditioning system, electrical system to be upgraded, interior/exterior doors and trim to be painted, rotted framing to be repaired, repair of existing windows, installation of new shutters and storm windows, in-kind partial replacement of roof, installation of flashings, installation of new chimney cap and flue liner, existing foundation as well as brick and cement piers to be reinforced/repared, basement waterproofing, installation of a new sump pump, installation of a drainage system and removal of an existing rear three-level stairway [County Council District #1]

"Tryconnell", 120 Woodbrook Lane, MIHP #BA1750, National Register of Historic Places; replacement of existing heating/cooling system, installation of storm windows, in-kind repair/replacement of slate roof, installation of a trenchless piping system to replace failing existing system [Council District #5]

Other Business

At the September 6, 2011 County Council meeting Bill 50-11 added three properties to the Final Landmarks List.

The Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Design Guidelines can be viewed on the County's web page. A public hearing on the Design Guidelines is

scheduled for Wednesday, November 2nd at 5:00 p.m. in room 104 of the Jefferson Building.

Fall 2011 Retreat is scheduled for October 27th at the Alms House.

Mr. Boswell discussed his recent attendance at the Governor's Consulting Committee meeting in Annapolis for the review of the Bare Hills and Anneslie Historic District applications. Both passed the committee unanimously although Anneslie was sent back to the applicant for some minor edits. Bare Hills and Anneslie has been sent forward to the Department of the Interior for review. Ms. Rising clarified that Anneslie still had to appear before the LPC before moving forward and indicated that would happen in November.

Mr. Bryant moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously on a voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 6:45 p.m.

TR:tr