

Minutes
Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission
February 9, 2012 Meeting

Mr. Bruce Boswell, Chairman, opened the regular monthly meeting of the Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) at 6: 10 p.m. The following Commission members were:

<u>Present</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
Ms. Carol Allen, Chairman	Mr. David Bryan
Mr. Robert P. Brennan, Vice Chairman	Mr. John E. Day
Ms. Rose A. Benton	Ms. Barbara Eckley
Mr. C. Bruce Boswell	Mr. Carl F. Herb
Mr. Louis S. Diggs	Mr. John W. Hill
Ms. Nancy W. Horst	Mr. Howard Perlow
Ms. Wendy McIver	Mr. Thomas J. Reynolds
Mr. Qutub U. K. Syed	

Attending County staff, Jeff Mayhew (Deputy Director, Department of Planning), Karin Brown (Chief, Preservation Services), Teri Rising (Preservation Services staff) and Vicki Nevy (Secretary to the Commission).

Review of the Agenda

1. Ms. Brown explained that changes to the Preliminary Agenda published on February 2, 2012 included the requested postponement of the public hearing scheduled for both “Holly Hill” and “Groff’s Mill”, the requested postponement of the project proposed for 1915 Monkton Road and the withdrawal of the proposal submitted for 211 Melancthon Avenue.

2. Approval of the Minutes

Ms. Allen asked if anyone proposed changes to the January 12, 2012 Minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Diggs moved to approve the January 12, 2012 Minutes. Ms. McIver seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Public Hearing on Nominations to the Preliminary Landmarks List

3. “Holly Hill”, House and setting, Cockeysville vicinity; MIHP #BA187, [County Council District #3]

Postponed at the request of staff until March 8, 2012

4. “Groff’s Mill” (Owings Upper Mill), Mill, House, Barn and setting, Reisterstown Road at or near Groff’s Lane, Owings Mills; MIHP # BA 52, [County Council District #2]

Postponed at the request of staff until March 8, 2012

Alteration to properties in County Historic Districts or Landmark structures

5. Crumpler property, 307 Central Avenue, “McKenny House”; MIHP #BA-771, contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District, contributing structure in the Glyndon National Register District; construction of a 1 story rear addition [County Council District #3]

Ms. Brown stated the current owner purchased the house in very poor condition and has completed extensive renovation work in keeping with the Secretary of Interior Standards. The owner proposes adding an addition at the rear elevation with an upper level porch on top of the addition. The owner also proposes replacing a side-yard window facing a wrap-around porch with a door.

The property owner, Ms. Crumpler, described the project and explained her reasoning for wishing to convert three windows at the rear façade into doorways that would provide access to the proposed upper level porch. She noted the width of the various openings would not be changed and the trim would match the existing trim. She stated that while she prefers to convert all three windows, she would be agreeable to converting only the center window to a doorway.

Mr. Boswell complimented Ms. Crumpler on the excellent work completed so far. However, he found the Victorian style door and casement style window depicted on the elevation drawings would not be appropriate for the house. Ms. Crumpler explained that these were the best styles available on the CAD system used for the elevation drawings and that her father, who is renovating her home, is very sensitive to picking an appropriate style.

Mr. Brennan noted the railing depicted on the drawings is not appropriate for the house. He suggested that a Technical Committee be formed to approve the homeowner’s final choice of style for the doors, windows and railing.

Mr. Diggs moved to vote to issue a certificate of appropriateness. Ms. McIver seconded the motion. Mr. Boswell suggested that the motion be amended as follows: to vote to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the addition, including the upper-storey porch, but that only the center window (of the three second story windows) can be converted to a doorway, and that the style of the door would be subject to approval by a Technical Committee. Likewise, the style of the proposed side door; the style of the double hung window (where currently a casement style is depicted), and the style of the railing on the upper-level porch, would also be subject to Technical Committee approval. Mr. Diggs accepted the amendments. The amended motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

6. “Baltimore County Bank”, 500 York Road, Towson; Final Landmarks List #304, MIHP #BA2490; request to replace original windows [County Council District #5]

Ms. Brown explained a proposal has been submitted on behalf of the prospective buyers of the building, who are trying to assess the feasibility of adapting the bank building to a law office prior to signing a contract of sale.

Mr. John DiMenna, architect for the prospective buyers, described the current condition of the existing windows and indicated the cost of repairing the windows would be prohibitive for his clients. In response to a question from Mr. Diggs in regard to what would happen to the automatic teller machine (ATM) currently situated on the front façade of the building, Mr. DiMenna replied that while his clients would remove the ATM, they have not yet determined what type of window they would use in it’s stead. He stated that the project being considered tonight is for replacing the existing windows.

Mr. Brennan spoke on behalf of the Technical Committee having toured the building and inspected the existing windows. He noted the Technical Committee supports the project, but that he has a few recommendations, which he would like the prospective buyers to consider. Also, he had concerns regarding the visual impact of the proposed panes used in the window system – if the windowpanes would be glazed on the exterior, the windows could look too dark - as if they had been painted out. Mr. DiMenna stated that the prospective buyers share this concern and are considering a gray shaded glass, which would minimize that effect.

Mr. Boswell stated that the Technical Committee supports the request to replace the windows, however, the preferred options would be repairing them. He inquired whether the prospective buyers had considered reducing the cost by making use of the commercial Historic Tax Credit. Mr. DiMenna responded that his clients asked their accountant to analyze the feasibility of doing so, but found no financial advantage in using the Tax Credit to make repairing the windows more cost effective. He presented a copy of the accountant report to the LPC and staff.

Mr. Boswell moved to vote to issue a Notice to Proceed subject to the following recommendations:

1. Fully explore the possibility of reducing the mullion profile below 2" wide by 1/4-1/2", perhaps with other manufacturers.
2. Apply the simulated divided light (SDL) on the glass both sides with the spacer, similar to Marvin Windows.
3. SDL to be 1" to match existing.
4. Spandrel glass of south elevation that conceals inserted floor structure to be darker to contrast with stone/grout-colored painted sash of windows.
5. Paint rather than clad existing steel frame to remain.
6. Consider reopening/replacing the skylight as part of the window package.

Ms. Horst seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

7. "Elm Nook", 211 Melancthon Avenue, Lutherville County Historic District, County Inventory #CI-331 (MIHP # BA-331); request to use composite decking materials for the rear porch [County Council District #3]

Ms. Brown reported the homeowner withdrew the request a few hours before the meeting citing the product as being too costly.

8. "Milford Meadows", 7300 Kathydale Road, Milford Mill vicinity; Final Landmarks List #255, MIHP #BA389; construction of a 2 story rear addition [County Council District #2]

Ms. Brown explained this project involves the replacement of an addition, which had been illegally demolished last year. The matter had been brought before the Hearing Officer who had imposed a fine. She noted that she encouraged the owner to engage the services of a Historic Preservation Architect to ascertain that the proposed addition would be as compatible as possible. Staff found the proposed addition unacceptable and staff's recommendation was to deny the issuance of a Notice to Proceed.

The homeowner, Mr. Nader, explained he hired an engineer to complete the drawings submitted for consideration and that he did so prior to meeting with the Technical Committee consisting of Mr. Boswell and Mr. Hill and before the

suggestion was made that he engage the services of a Historic Preservation Architect. Mr. Nader commented that he has since met with Mr. Jeffrey Lees, who informed him that he could not revise the drawings, but would have to do them over. Mr. Nader stated he was financially not in a position to hire Mr. Lees. Mr. Nader mentioned Mr. Lees' offered recommendations other than those suggested by the Technical Committee.

Mr. Boswell stated that while the footprint of the addition is not an issue, several other features of the elevation drawings are problematic.

Mr. Syed expressed his appreciation to the homeowner for his efforts to resolve the matter, however, found the drawings of no use and felt any architect should be able to provide Mr. Nader with adequate drawings. He implored the homeowner to engage an architect to prepare drawings for the LPC to consider at a subsequent meeting. Mr. Syed asked Mr. Nader why he purchased the property. Mr. Nader stated he intended to live in the house.

Mr. Brennan suggested Mr. Nader refer to the Technical Committee report and find someone capable of preparing adequate drawings.

Mr. Boswell moved to vote to NOT issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or a Notice to Proceed. Mr. Syed seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Applications for Tax Credit

9. Cost property, 418 Murdock Road, contributing structure in the Rodgers Forge National Register District; replacement of existing slate back porch roof with asphalt shingles [County Council District #5]

Ms. Brown explained staff felt the addition was not eligible for the tax credit program and that replacing the slate roof with asphalt shingle would not be in keeping with the Design Guidelines. She advised the homeowner that he can proceed with the project, but that he would not be eligible for the tax credit.

Mr. Syed stated he would accept the proposal should the homeowner choose to replace the slate in-kind.

Mr. Cost, the homeowner, indicated the contractor had recommended against using slate due to the existing pitch of the roof.

Mr. Boswell noted the slate roof has apparently served the home well in the past. He suggested the homeowners consider submitting another application, one that would involve raising the pitch of the roof if necessary and replacing the slate in kind.

Mr. Diggs moved to vote to NOT issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the application as presented. Mr. Boswell seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

10. Gardenghi property, 102 Forest Drive, contributing structure in the Central Catonsville/Summit Park National Register District; replacement of existing asphalt shingle roof with fiberglass shingles and replacement of existing aluminum siding surrounding two front dormers with 5” vinyl siding [County Council District #1]

Ms. Brown read staff’s recommendation, to approve the replacement of the existing asphalt shingles with fiberglass shingles but in keeping with the Design Guidelines, to approve a Tax Credit for the replacement of the existing siding only, if a composite material would be used instead of vinyl.

Ms. McIver moved to vote to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness subject to the siding materials surrounding the two front dormers being made of composite materials. Mr. Syed seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Mr. Diggs moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Brennan seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously on a voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 7:30 p.m.

VKN:vkn