

**Minutes**  
**Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission**  
**April 11, 2013 Meeting**

Mr. Rob Brennan, Vice-Chair, opened the regular monthly meeting of the Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) at 6: 00 p.m. The following Commission members were:

<u>Present</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
Mr. Robert P. Brennan, Vice-Chair	Ms. Carol Allen
Mr. C. Bruce Boswell	Mr. David Bryan
Ms. Rose A. Benton	Mr. Ed Hord
Mr. Louis S. Diggs	
Ms. Barbara Eckley	
Ms. Nancy W. Horst	
Ms. Wendy McIver	
Mr. Stephen P. Myer	
Mr. Qutub U. K. Syed	
Mr. David S. Thaler	

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

1. Review of the Agenda

Ms. Brown explained two changes were made to the Preliminary Agenda. One item was changed into a consent agenda item and one tax credit project was added.

2. Approval of the Minutes

Mr. Brennan asked if anyone proposed changes to the March 14, 2013 Minutes. Hearing none, he called for a motion to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Diggs moved to approve the Minutes. Ms. McIver seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

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

4. "Litter Louna" Springhouse, Barn and setting, 3121 Old Court Road, Pikesville [County Council District #2]

*Postponed until May 9, 2013*

**Alterations to Landmarks structures or properties in County Historic Districts**

5. Lutheran (Old German) Community Cemetery, 19 Cockeys Mill Road, Reisterstown, Final Landmarks List #120; stabilization and restoration of the brick wall surrounding the cemetery.

Ms. Brown reported this project involved the stabilization and restoration of the brick wall surrounding the cemetery. The current caretakers of the cemetery have obtained an expert on historic brick construction, who prepared a detailed proposal for the restoration of the wall.

Mr. Brennan determined no one present wished to speak on this item.

Mr. Diggs moved to vote to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposed work. Ms. McIver seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

6. Smith property, 601 Cliveden Road, non-contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District; installation of metal handrails on either side of the front steps.

Ms. Horst requested that the matter be pulled from the Consent Agenda to be discussed by the Commission.

Ms. Brown described the project and noted that the Sudbrook Park historic advisory group wrote a letter of support for the project, even though few details were provided. She also noted the property owner was not present.

Mr. Syed questioned what type of railing was to be installed. Ms. Brown responded that the applicant did not provide that information. Mr. Boswell noted the current railings included finials. Mr. Diggs had no issue with the proposal. Ms. Horst thought it could be more attractively designed. Mr. Diggs moved to vote to issue a Notice to Proceed. Mr. Thaler seconded the motion, which failed with Ms. McIver, Ms. Horst, Mr. Syed and Mr. Boswell voting against the motion.

Mr. Syed moved to vote to issue a Notice to Proceed with the installation of a railing of the same design as what currently exists; the railing would need to follow the contour of the ridge of the sides of the brick porch steps. Ms. Benton seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

7. Bacon-Crosby House, 2939 Monkton Road, Final Landmarks List # 62, contributing structure in the My Lady's Manor National Register District; ex-post facto approval for the in-kind replacement of the roof, the replacement of exterior storm windows with interior storm windows, repairs of original wood windows, the replacement of wood siding with cement board siding and the extension of a rear porch.

Ms. Brown explained that most of the work being considered has already been completed. Staff did not provide an action recommendation because the replacement of the wood siding with cement boards does not constitute in-kind replacement. She noted the homeowners indicated they had checked the County's My Neighborhood database and did not see the property listed on the Final Landmarks List, but did notice that it was listed on the Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties (MIHP). The property owner contacted the Maryland Historic Preservation Trust, which informed her that MIHP numbered properties were not subject to any regulations. Ms. Rising pulled up the property on the My Neighborhood web page, which showed that the property was listed as a Landmarks structure. Ms. Brown informed the LPC that the fact that the property was a Landmarks structure was also entered in the Deed of Easement and that the Commission could view the language in the materials provided to them in the binders.

Ms. Brown noted that the wood siding was not original and that staff had information on file that the wood siding had been replaced in 1981. She showed a photo of the dwelling taken in 2002. The owner indicated that there was a remnant of the wood siding left in place under a rear porch. Ms. Brown reported that she visited the site prior to the meeting and observed a difference in appearance between the wood siding and cement board. Ms. Brown noted that except for the siding, the work was done in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.

Mr. Brennan asked for a short history of the house. Ms. Rising directed the LPC to the Deed of Easement, which indicates the main residence dates to 1798 and is a contributing structure within the My Lady's Manor National Register District.

Mr. Thaler asked Ms. Brown to clarify the issue at hand. Ms. Brown explained the homeowners did not come before the LPC for approval of the work as required by law and that part of the work was not completed in accordance with the Secretary of Interior Standards, which calls for repair or in-kind replacement of materials. She explained if they had come before the LPC, it is likely a

Technical Committee would have visited the site to evaluate the condition of the siding. They would have determined whether the siding was beyond repair and how best to address the matter.

Ms. Hawks, one of the owners of the property confirmed they were not aware the property was on the Final Landmarks List. She stated they had purchased the property from the Crosby family and the youngest daughter, Sarah Crosby did not mention it was on the Final Landmarks List. Ms. Hawks explained they researched the pros and cons of wood siding vs. cement board and found current wood siding not to be or the same quality as it used to be. She pointed out they intentionally chose cement board of a 1/16" thickness to resemble the wood siding as closely as possible. Because the wood siding dated to 1981, they did not feel they were destroying historically original materials. Ms. Hawks stated that all of the materials they choose are materials supported for use by the Secretary of Interior Standards. She indicated she sits on the Board of the My Lady's Manor Conservancy and had shared their plans for rehabilitation of the property with them. She noted the entire community is happy to see the house being restored and cared for.

Mr. Brennan explained that as volunteer stewards of the Final Landmarks List, County Historic Districts and National Register Historic Districts, it is imperative projects come before the LPC for consideration in advance of work being undertaken.

Ms. Hawks noted that work being done without LPC consideration is common in the My Lady's Manor National Historic District.

Mr. Boswell pointed out that unlike Final Landmark List structures, structures within the bounds of a National Historic District are not required to obtain approval for exterior alterations.

Mr. Boswell asked Ms. Hawks why all of the siding needed replacement. Ms. Hawks explained the siding was pulling away from most of the window edges; knots were falling out of the siding, which allowed for water to penetrate. They decided to go ahead and replace all of the siding because they felt it was just a matter of time before all of the siding would fail. Mr. Boswell noted knots falling out of siding are indicative of a lesser quality siding.

Mr. Diggs asked Ms. Brown whether in her opinion there is a visible difference between the previous wood siding and the cement board siding, if viewed from the road. Ms. Brown responded there is no visible difference.

Ms. McIver asked what material the exterior of the house had originally been. Ms. Rising stated there was information in the file indicating extensive restoration work was done on the wood siding in 1981 which lead her to believe the house had originally been clad in wood siding.

Mr. Thaler moved to vote to issue an ex-post facto approval for the in-kind replacement of the roof, replacement of exterior storm windows with interior storm windows, repairs of original wood windows, replacement of cedar siding with ½' cement board siding and extension of a rear porch. Mr. Syed seconded the motion. Mr. Boswell suggested amending the motion to include a statement that the work would not be eligible for a tax credit because the proposals had not been approved in advance of commencing with the rehabilitation work. Mr. Thaler agreed to accept the amendment. The amended motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

After the amended motion passed, Mr. Brennan apologized for not recognizing Ms. Trish Bentz, who had signed up to speak on behalf of the Preservation Alliance of Baltimore County. Ms. Bentz noted she did not object to the approval of the work, however, she did wish to address the LPC regarding this matter. She thanked Ms. Hawks and commended her for the work being done on the house. Ms. Bentz proposed suggestions for avoiding similar situations in the future, which included organizing a group to oversee the community of Monkton by a local advisory group in the same fashion as Lutherville or Sudbrook Park were advised; and educating real estate agents on the importance of correctly informing prospective buyers of historical designations. Ms. McIver stated she believes the problem is confusion about the different requirements for National Register Historic Districts, County Historic Districts and Final Landmarks List properties. Mr. Thaler commented that while these are all good points, historic preservation is complicated and owners can be confused. He noted he had never seen a Deed of Easement even remotely similar to the one involved with this property and yet, a very sophisticated homeowner had missed the requirement for obtaining prior approval for work, which leaves them penalized, by missing the opportunity to receive tax credits.

8. Mattson House, Jones property, 200 W. Seminary Avenue; contributing structure in both the Lutherville National Register District and the Lutherville County Historic District; replacement of existing 5 ft high concave top privacy fence with a 6 ft. high, flat top privacy fence and conversion of an existing gravel topped parking pad to an asphalt topped parking pad.

Ms. Brown described the proposal and noted the homeowner was present. Mr. Jones explained the house is situated alongside a busy intersection within the Lutherville community.

Mr. Boswell stated he was concerned that the fence, as it is currently positioned, appears to be an extension of the front facade of the house. He thought this visually diminished the details of the house. He asked Mr. Jones if he would be amenable to setting the front yard fence back by a foot or two in order to make the house visually stronger. Mr. Jones explained the fence served to keep lights and

sounds from coming through the side living room windows. While he was willing to set the fence back from the line where it currently exists, he did not wish to do so in a manner that would expose the side living room windows.

Mr. Boswell moved to vote to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness subject to the front fence line being set back 12 to 18 inches from the front side corner of the house. Mr. Syed seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

### **Historic Environmental Setting Delineation**

- \*\*9. “Mount Welcome Retreat”, 3144 Granite Road, Granite; Final Landmarks List # 246; Owner request to delineate the entire 8.3 acre parcel as the Historic Environmental Setting (HES)

Approved via the consent agenda to issue a Notice to Proceed.

### **Applications for Tax Credit**

- \*\*10. Hummel property, 43 Dunkirk Road, contributing structure in the Rodgers Forge National Register District; installation of a central air conditioning system

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

11. Althaus property, 212 W. Seminary Avenue, contributing structure in both the Lutherville National Register District and the Lutherville County Historic District; in-kind repair and replacement of rotted wood porch.

Ms. Brown described the project and noted staff’s recommendation to vote to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Ms. Horst asked if the LPC had previously visited this property because windows had been replaced without prior approval. Ms. Brown confirmed that a Technical Committee had paid a visit to the property when considering an ex post facto request for window replacement.

Mr. Boswell recalled that at the time of the Technical Committee site visit the property owner had indicated she intended to also replace the side windows. If she went through with that, he did not think that a tax credit should be granted. Mr. Boswell moved to vote to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness pending on verification that no inappropriate work has been completed since the unauthorized window replacement took place. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

- \*\*12. Igusa/Renggli property, 7011 Copeleigh Road, contributing structure in the Stoneleigh National Register District; in-kind replacement of copper flashing

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

***Report on County Tax Credit applications approved, or emergency repair approved***

The following historic property tax credit application was approved by staff as an emergency repair or due to the receipt of Part II approval for work reviewed by MHT:

Althaus property, 212 W. Seminary Avenue, contributing structure in both the Lutherville National Register District and the Lutherville County Historic District; replacement of rolled roofing on two alcove roofs with standing seam aluminum roofing and in-kind repairs/replacement of gutters.

Beaupin property, 2 N. Beechwood Avenue, contributing structure in the Old Catonsville National Register District; in-kind repair/replacement of existing asphalt shingle roof

**Other Business**

Ms. Brown explained the Spring Retreat venue was being changed to the Sherwood House in Cromwell Valley Park.

Ms. Rising reported funding for repairs and renovation of the Battle Acre Monument site had been received. The project had been previously approved by the LPC and had support from multiple stakeholders. The \$100,000 funding was expected to adequately cover all of the renovations.

Ms. Brown extended an invitation to the LPC to attend the April 18, 2013 meeting of the Planning Board. Mr. Lee Sobel and Mr. Christopher Coes would offer a presentation entitled *Smart Growth and Economic Success*.

Mr. Thaler mentioned the upcoming Star Spangled Spectacular is set for September, 2013. He thought it could be a good opportunity for the LPC to be involved with events outside of the standard scope of responsibility. He also mentioned the 250<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Mason Dixon Survey would be taking place in November, 2014, which could be another opportunity worth considering.

Mr. Diggs moved to adjourn the meeting. McMcIver seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously on a voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 7:50 p.m.

VKN:vkn