

**Minutes**  
**Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission**  
**July 12, 2012 Meeting**

Ms. Carol Allen, Chairman, opened the regular monthly meeting of the Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) at 6: 00 p.m. The following Commission members were:

Present\_\_\_\_\_

Ms. Carol Allen, Chairman  
 Mr. Robert P. Brennan, Vice Chairman  
 Ms. Rose A. Benton  
 Mr. C. Bruce Boswell  
 Mr. David Bryan  
 Mr. Louis S. Diggs  
 Ms. Barbara Eckley  
 Mr. Rainier C. Harvey, Sr.  
 Ms. Wendy McIver

Not Present

Mr. John W. Hill  
 Ms. Nancy W. Horst  
 Mr. Thomas J. Reynolds  
 Mr. Qutub U. K. Syed  
 Mr. David S. Thaler

Attending County staff, Andrea Van Arsdale (Director, Department of Planning), Karin Brown (Chief, Preservation Services), Teri Rising (Preservation Services staff), Jennifer Frankovich (Assistant County Attorney) and Vicki Nevy (Secretary to the Commission).

1. Review of the Agenda

Ms. Brown noted that changes to the Preliminary Agenda published on July 5, 2012 included the addition of one proposed alteration to a Final Landmarks List property and the addition of a tax credit application.

2. Approval of the Minutes

Ms. Allen asked if anyone proposed changes to the June 14, 2012 Minutes. Hearing none, she called for a motion to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Bryan moved to approve the Minutes. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

**Public Hearing on a Nomination to the Preliminary Landmarks List**

4. "Boxwood" (Belle Grove Gardener's House) house and setting, 11 S. Belle Grove Road, Catonsville, MIHP # BA-3274

Ms. Rising presented the history of the property and read staff's recommendation to support the nomination.

Two owners of an adjacent property each spoke in support of the nomination. An additional neighboring property owner expressed her support for the nomination. Staff also received a letter of support, which was included in the materials given to the members of the Commission.

Mr. Howard Alderman, representing the owners of the subject property, introduced Ms. Kirsten Peeler, senior project manager at Goodwin Associates. Ms. Peeler made a presentation in which she expressed her doubts that the property in question was associated with Belle Grove. She stated that preliminary archival and map research does not clearly depict the location of the caretaker's house. The 1898 Bromley Atlas shows eight buildings, including a L-shaped structure adjacent to a square shaped building south of the principal dwelling. The 1915 Bromley Atlas shows two buildings, showing a square shaped building to the south of Belle Grove. Additionally, a photograph purportedly showing the gardener/caretaker's house, also shows a square building.

Mr. Diggs asked Ms. Peeler what the eight buildings associated with Belle Grove were used for and whether any of them still remain. Ms. Peeler was not able to say. Ms. Rising responded that the 1911 tax assessment records at the Maryland State Archives provide a description of all the structures present at that time. From that record she garnered that most of the 8 buildings were accessory structures, but none of the accessory structures are remaining. She commented further that the early atlases are not overly accurate in regard to their depiction of the exact shape and physical location of structures on a property. She had obtained her reference through the tax assessment records, which describe the buildings, as they existed at that time.

Mr. Boswell asked if both Boxwood and Belle Grove existed on the same parcel at one time. Ms. Rising answered that if he was referring to Belle Grove mansion and the gardener's house, yes, the parcels were joined at one time. Addressing Ms. Peeler, Mr. Boswell asked her about references to a photograph and plans and whether she could share them with the Commission. Ms. Peeler responded that she was referring to a photograph that was given to her by the owners and that the photograph showed a square shaped building whereas Boxwood was an L-shaped building. Ms. Rising interjected that the photo Ms. Peeler referred to was

included among the items that were submitted as part of the nomination and was included in the Commissioner's binder under Tab 4. She explained staff's report did not use that photo to substantiate that the house in the photo was the caretaker/gardener's house, nor was it used in staff's report. Instead, Ms. Rising used various tax and estate records, which cited the building in question.

Mr. Alderman presented additional materials outlining the various points of his client's opposition to the nomination. He maintained that the nomination was a hostile action based on the erroneous beliefs that the current owners plan to subdivide the property into 24 townhomes. Additionally he argued that "Boxwood" is functionally and physically separated from the Belle Grove mansion and thus cannot be the gardener's house. Lastly, he stated that numerous inappropriate alterations had been made to the building, undermining its historic integrity.

Mr. Diggs moved to vote to (a) place "Boxwood" (Belle Grove Gardener's House, Harmon House) & setting on the Preliminary Landmarks List under criteria (1) - for its association with the settlement and development of the Catonsville community; as a tangible reminder of the large estates that once dominated Catonsville with its vast acreage, fields, gardens and staff; for its association with the historically significant Howell, Harmon, Preston, and Smith families (2) - as an excellent example of a rural vernacular style that retains historic integrity in terms of location, materials and setting to convey these associations. (3) - as the work of a master builder through its incorporation of architectural details including its deep bracketed eaves, shingle style and semi circular windows. (b) to delineate the entire property, 2.29 acres total (map 101, parcel 1084), as its historic environmental setting.

Mr. Boswell indicated that based upon the pictures presented, he had some doubt that the subject house was indeed the original gardener's house.

Ms. Rising stated that the tax records, census tract information and anecdotal information all support staff's recommendation.

Mr. Brennan indicated it could be possible that the placement of the porch may have been changed when the street was cut into the parcel and that the integrity of the structure remains.

Ms. Brown advised the owners and their attorney that landmarking the property would not preclude future development - the only impact the designation would have is that future subdivision plans and new construction would need LPC approval and would have to be compatible with the historic Boxwood House.

Mr. Bryan seconded the motion, which passed on a voice vote with Mr. Harvey voting against the motion.

**Alteration to properties in County Historic Districts or Landmark structures**

- \*\*5. Bell property, 703/705 Woodland Drive, Relay, non-contributing property in the Relay County Historic District; proposed minor subdivision [County Council District #1]

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

6. Easter property, 302 Central Avenue, Glyndon; contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District and the Glyndon National Register District; request to construct a concrete pad and an overhang over the side entrance door [County Council District #3]

Ms. Brown stated that portions of the proposal involving the side entrance for a tax credit applicati on had been approved at the June 13, 2012 meeting. The only aspect to be considered this evening was the appropriateness of a proposed overhang and the reconfiguration of the existing steps and the construction of a pad clad in blue stone. She stated that except for the replacement of a non-historic door, the overhang and step reconfiguration were not tax credit eligible.

Mr. Boswell moved to vote to issue a certificate of appropriateness for replacing the existing concrete step and landing with two blue stone covered steps and a blue stone covered landing; the replacement of the existing non-historic door in the style proposed by the owner; and to construct an overhang over the side entrance door in the style proposed by the owner. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

7. "Griffith's Adventure" (Short property), 3601 Garth Manor Court, Granite; Final Landmarks List # 244, MIHP #BA-11; add sliding doors to center openings of stable, add one window to stable side opening, repoint stable walls, install half round gutters on stable and ice house, build a 12'x 20' wood shed, and build 6 foot tall vertical board-on-board fence surrounding a garden [County Council District #4]

Ms. Brown described the proposal and noted staff's recommendation to vote to issue a certificate of appropriateness.

Mr. Diggs asked the owner of the property what is on the inside of the structure.

Mr. Boswell asked if the structure had ever been fully enclosed and expressed a concern about the possibility of damaging the stone as a result of adding sliding doors and cutting in of a window.

The owner of the property, Mr. Ken Short, answered that the stable consists of two empty rooms joined by an opening in the center. He explained gateposts had existed along the side the opening at one time, however, he had no reason to believe it had ever been fully enclosed. He anticipates using the space to house books and feels the clear sliding glass doors and window will allow adequate light into the space. He anticipates adaptively reusing only one side of the structure.

Ms. Brown reported no Historic Environmental Setting exists on this property and that the LPC had no purview over the proposed 12' x 20' wooden shed and the 6' vertical board-on-board fence.

Mr. Boswell moved to issue a certificate of appropriateness for the proposals with the understanding that there be no damage to the stones. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion, which passed with Mr. Brennan voting against it.

8. Saffer property, 16514 Garfield Avenue, Monkton; contributing structure in the Monkton County Historic District and the My Lady's Manor National Register District; installation of a 48 inch tall black metal picket fence around an in-ground pool and construction of a wood pergola with a 36 inch tall stone veneered base along one side of the pool [County Council District #3]

Ms. Brown described the proposal and read staff's recommendation to vote to issue a certificate of appropriateness.

Mr. Bryan moved to vote to issue a certificate of appropriateness. Ms. McIver seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

9. Pleasant Grove United Methodist Church, Reisterstown; Final Landmarks List # 143, MIHP # BA-1162; replacement of an existing pine door with a custom milled fir door of the same style [County Council District #3]

Ms. Brown stated that a proposal to replace the existing main entrance door with a fiberglass product had been submitted to staff previously. After conducting a site visit, a Technical Committee consisting of Messrs. Boswell, Brennan and Diggs and Ms. Brown representing staff, found a fiberglass door to be inconsistent with the character of the church, suggesting they consider using a more historically appropriate material. The current proposal is in keeping with the Technical Committee's suggestion.

Mr. Diggs moved to vote to issue a certificate of appropriateness for the replacement of the existing pine door with a custom milled fir door of the same style. Mr. Brennan seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

#### **Applications for Tax Credit**

- \*\*10. "Shriver House" (Majestic property), 607 Sudbrook Road, Pikesville, contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District, MIHP # BA-3041; replacement of existing aluminum siding with cedar shakes and wood lap siding; removal of window trim and molding and replacement with cementitious molding milled to match historically accurate molding [County Council District # 2]

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

11. "Hoffmeister-Barrow House" (Noel property), 9304 Philadelphia Road, MIHP #BA-2436, Final Landmarks List #376; window and door replacements and the alteration of the current dimensions of window openings at the rear façade and rear side facade [County Council District #6]

Ms. Brown reported a Technical Committee, consisting of Ms. Allen and Ms. Benton and Ms. Brown representing staff had visited the site to consider the owner's proposal to replace all window and doors. Ms. Benton prepared a Technical Committee report on which the below staff recommendations are based.

Ms. Brown explained that the Technical Committee supported the replacement of some of the windows, but recommends that the windows most visible from the street should be repaired. The justification for the request to alter the dimensions of the rear (and one side) windows is to accommodate kitchen counters. Furthermore, she did not believe that the windows in question were original. Additionally, the Technical Committee would support the replacement of one non-historic door with a window (Note: it appeared likely that the door replaced a window when the dwelling was converted into apartments).

Ms. Allen explained she felt the new owners of the property should be commended for the work they have completed since having purchased the property.

Ms. McIver moved to vote to issue a certificate of appropriateness with the following stipulations:

Front (east) façade: All existing windows must be repaired. The door can be replaced provided the new door is made of wood and displays the same pattern as the original door.

Side (south) façade: The windows can be replaced provided they are made of wood, and have the same style and muntin profile as the original windows. The shape of one window can be changed to accommodate kitchen counters. The doors can be replaced provided they are made of wood and replicate the original doors in style and pattern. One non-historic door can be replaced with a wooden window (wood, same style and muntin profile as the abutting windows); the gable windows must be repaired.

Side (north) façade: The ground floor window closest to Philadelphia Road and the gable window must be repaired. The windows on the long portion of the side façade and the door can be replaced, provided they are made of wood (same style and muntin profile/pattern) as the existing windows and door.

Rear (west) façade: The windows can be replaced and their dimension can be changed provided they are constructed of wood, have the same style (two-over two) and have the same muntin profile as the other windows on the dwelling.

Mr. Boswell seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

12. “Inverness Farm” (Frank property), 2800 Monkton Road, contributing structure in the My Lady’s Manor National Register District, MIHP #BA118; extensive renovation of a barn and stable [County Council District #3]

Ms. Brown read staff’s recommendation to vote to issue a certificate of appropriateness for the extensive renovation of both the barn and the stable.

The property owner, Mr. Raymond Frank, was present to answer any questions raised. He noted all work would be completed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

Mr. Diggs moved to vote to issue a certificate of appropriateness for the rehabilitation of both the barn and the stable. Mr. Boswell seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

- \*\*13. Price property, 719 Pleasant Hill Road, contributing structure in the Oella National Register District; in kind repair of wood lap siding, exterior painting and in kind gutter replacement [County Council District #1]

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

### ***Report on County Tax Credit applications approved***

Ms. Brown reported the following historic property tax credit application was approved by staff as an emergency repair:

“Thompson House” (Frederick property) 223 Morris Avenue, Lutherville; contributing structure in the Lutherville County Historic District and the Lutherville National Register District; MIHP # BA-318; in-kind replacement of the oil tank and repair of the internal sewer line [County Council District # 3].

### **Code Violation**

14. “Trentham” and immediate cluster of outbuildings, 135 Village Queen Drive, Final Landmarks List #14, MHIP # BA-041; unauthorized demolition of three of the outbuildings; various unauthorized exterior alterations to the mansion and outbuildings [County Council District # 3].

Ms. Brown explained this matter involves the unauthorized demolition of three outbuildings and various unauthorized exterior alterations to the mansion and outbuildings. She summarized how Preservation Services came to learn about the extent of the Code violations, noting that the complexity of the matter necessitated the involvement of Code Enforcement, the Building Engineer and the Law Office. Numerous meetings with representatives of these agencies resulted in a Letter of Demand (written by the Building Engineer), which specified corrective actions that needed to be taken by the property owner. Ms. Brown noted that she subsequently met with the owner and Mr. Lees, an architect representing the owner. She advised them to develop a correction plan that outlines corrective actions they would take in response to the Letter of Demand. She also informed them that the LPC would consider these corrective actions when making recommendations to the Building Engineer. A Technical Committee would conduct a site visit and the owner and his architect would have an opportunity to present their case. A Technical committee, consisting of Ms. Allen, Ms. Horst and Messrs. Brennan, Boswell, Diggs and agency staff (Ms. Frankovich from the Law Office, Mr. Garland from Code Enforcement and Ms. Brown representing Preservation Services), met at the site to evaluate the matter. Staff's recommendations to reconstruct the three demolished buildings, or pay a fine commensurate with the reconstruction of the buildings and to replace all the vinyl windows with wooden, true divided light windows, were based on the Technical Committee's recommendations.

Mr. Bryan asked how a fine would be determined in these cases. Ms. Frankovich, attorney to the to the LPC, explained the County Code has a specific provision for determining fines and affords the Administrative Law Judge wide discretionary authority.



Ms. Brown noted that another important aspect of this case is that any action taken by the LPC will be precedent setting. It is for this reason that staff supported the Technical Committee recommendations in requesting that all demolished buildings be rebuild.

Mr. Harvey asked if the demolitions had been permitted. Ms. Brown answered 'no' they had not.

Mr. Jeffrey Lees, speaking on behalf of the property owner, introduced himself and commented on the Technical Committee recommendations. He explained that while he does not condone the demolitions, he disagrees with the recommendation that the historic buildings be reconstructed. He asked whether the LPC is proposing reconstruction in order to create a museum. In his opinion, reconstruction would only serve to create a fictional recreation of the site and would not contribute to the overall feel of the site, as it exists in the community now. He felt that the LPC's recommendations amounted to retribution

The owner of the property, Mr. Kevin Walsh, stated that the springhouse was severely damaged when a trash truck struck it in 2008 and the recent earthquake caused the tenant house to shift in a manner that rendered it structurally unsafe. He maintained that a former tenant died as a result of its poor condition and that he is in possession of numerous County memos citing unsafe conditions that needed to be addressed. As a result, he felt he had no other choice than to demolish the buildings. He proceeded to complete the work on the main house. He felt the work was worthy of an award and considers himself the savior of Trentham mansion. He assured the LPC the work was completed to very high standards. Referring to an e-mail, he noted, a historic tax consultant informed him that the property did not need any historic permits if the owner did not apply for historic tax credits (Note: the e-mail referred to by the owner postdates the Letter of Demand issued by the Building Engineer, that is, the buildings had already been demolished and the unauthorized alterations made.)

Mr. Bryan commented that he found it difficult to believe that anyone would not know you need permits for the demolitions and type of work completed at this site. He further stated the Technical Committee recommendations had been prepared in consideration of the precedent setting nature of this case and were not intended to be retributive.

Mr. Harvey asked Ms. Frankovich to explain the administrative process. Ms. Frankovich explained that a property owner is allowed 30 days to resolve the violations and if the violations were not addressed within that time frame, the matter would automatically be scheduled for a hearing before an Administrative Law Judge (Note: Subsequent to the LPC hearing Ms. Frankovich checked the Code and found Sections 3-6-205 stating that once a citation is issued, the owner may contest the citation, by filing with the Code Official or Director, within 15 days after receipt of the citation, a written request for a code enforcement hearing). The resulting decision can be appealed. The LPC is charged with making a recommendation to the Building Engineer who in turn makes a recommendation to the Administrative Law Judge.

Mr. Walsh shared that the trash truck driver denied he struck the spring house and that he replaced the windows because they had been causing damage to the foundation.

Mr. Boswell explained the outbuildings were important because they helped tell the story of the property. Nevertheless he suggested the LPC consider a compromise other than what the Technical Committee Report recommended.

Ms. Eckley noted that since joining this commission, she has seen the LPC and other property owners work out compromises and come to mutually agreeable resolutions of problems. Addressing Mr. Lees, she informed him that she did not appreciate the aggressive adversarial approach taken by him.

Ms. Allen called for a motion.

Mr. Walsh apologized for having harmed the property.

Mr. Bryan moved to make the following recommendations:

Rebuild the three buildings (Spring house, a.k.a. milk house #3, tenant house #4 and garden shed # 7) that were demolished on their original site, or pay a fine equal to the amount of reconstructing the building;

Permit the chimney on Stone Shed #6 to remain as is;

Permit the glass block windows installed on Trentham Mansion #1 to remain as installed;  
Permit the front porch, deck and supporting stonewalls on Trentham Mansion #1 to remain as installed;  
Permit the side façade and modern deck on Trentham Mansion #1 to remain as installed;

Replace windows on Trentham Mansion #1 with wooden, true divided light windows to be approved by the LPC;

Permit the windows and door installed on Bath House #3 to remain as installed.

Mr. Brennan seconded the motion.

Mr. Walsh interrupted by stating the milk house and the stonewall were not on his property.

This statement could not be verified at the time of the meeting and Mr. Bryan subsequently withdrew his motion.

Mr. Boswell moved to table the matter until the September 13, 2012 meeting of the LPC, Mr. Harvey seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

**Other Business**

Ms. Brown reported that Ms. McIver, Ms. Benton and she would be attending the Forum 2012 Conference in Norfolk the following week.

Mr. Brennan moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously on a voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

VKN:vkn