

Minutes
Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission
May 12, 2016 Meeting

Call to order; introduction of Commission members; pledge of allegiance to the Flag; statement of purpose and operating procedures

Mr. Rob Brennan, Chairperson, opened the regular monthly meeting of the Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) at 6:01 p.m. The following Commission members were:

Present

Not Present

Mr. Robert P. Brennan, Chair
Ms. Carol Allen
Ms. Rose A. Benton
Mr. C. Bruce Boswell
Mr. Louis Diggs
Ms. Faith Nevins Hawks
Mr. Ed Hord
Ms. Nancy W. Horst, Vice-Chair
Mr. Mitch Kellman
Mr. Stephen P. Myer
Mr. Qutub U. K. Syed
Mr. David S. Thaler
Mr. Richard Yaffe

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

1. **Review of the Agenda**

Ms. Rising noted the only change to the Preliminary Agenda published May 5, 2016 was the addition of Item #6 to the Consent Agenda.

2. **Approval of the Minutes**

Mr. Brennan asked if anyone proposed changes to the April 14, 2016 Minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Brennan called for a motion to approve the Minutes as drafted.

Ms. Allen moved to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Myer seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Allen, Ms. Benton, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Ms. Nevins Hawks, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Mr. Kellman, Mr. Myer, Mr. Syed, Mr. Thaler and Mr. Yaffe and no dissenting votes.

3. **Consent Agenda**

Ms. Rising read the Action Recommendation for Consent Agenda Items 6, 7, 10, 11 and 14.

Mr. Brennan called for a motion. Mr. Diggs moved to approve the consent agenda items as presented. Mr. Syed seconded the motion with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Allen, Ms. Benton, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Ms. Nevins Hawks, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Mr. Kellman, Mr. Myer, Mr. Syed, Mr. Thaler and Mr. Yaffe and no dissenting votes.

Public Hearing on Nomination to the Preliminary Landmarks List

4. “Woodbrook Cottage” (house and setting), 111 Woodbrook Lane
MIHP #BA-3310

Ms. Rising explained this nomination was submitted by a third party this past February. Originally scheduled for the April 14th, 2016 meeting of the LPC, the owner’s representative requested it be postponed to the May 12th, 2016 meeting. She reported a technical committee consisting of herself, Mr. Boswell, Ms. Horst, Mr. Myer, Mr. Syed and Ms. Nevy visited the site on May 2nd, 2016 and prepared a report for consideration. Ms. Rising provided information included in the survey prepared and distributed for review. She stated staff believes that the property should be added to the preliminary landmarks list under criteria (1) – for its association with both William H. Perot and William F. Cochran’s Woodbrook estate; the development of area now known as Woodbrook; and as a surviving artifact from several phases of suburbanization in Baltimore County whose modification of form and design fit the unique location, availability of buildings, and function in order to reflect a pattern of life in Baltimore County and represent the community’s distinct character and (2) – as an example of vernacular architecture whose 20th century Cottage Gothic and 20th century Craftsman elements combined retain integrity in form, craftsmanship and materials and represent the evolution of ownership.

Mr. Brennan complimented Ms. Rising for the exhaustive research conducted and writing of the survey prepared.

Mr. Brennan asked for review of the Technical Committee report and Ms. Rising read the report into the record. Mr. Thaler voiced a point of order to note that while he was unable to attend the site visit, he was a member of the Technical Committee and agreed

with Mr. Syed's recommendation to not add the structure to the Preliminary Landmarks List.

Mr. David Karceski of Venable, LLC, representing both the contract purchasers of the subject property and the current property owners, presented a review of the full Development Review process the project has moved through since Fall of 2012. That process included various community input meetings, consideration of proposals by the hearing officer, approval of a pattern book and declarations being filed with the deed(s) as part of the covenants for the community. He noted many residents of Woodbrook Lane attended the various meetings and were well informed as to proposals being made and plans being approved for the area.

Mr. Karceski contended the house could have been nominated in 2013 at the beginning of the development process or even years before that point. He expressed concern about the landmark process being used for purposes for which it was not established. He elaborated that the Browns should be commended for being good stewards of the area and for the high quality residential community ultimately approved.

Mr. Karceski explained he would introduce an owner of the property, a representative of the developers and an architect to make additional presentations to the Commission. He also advised that his client's preference is for the Woodbrook Cottage not to be placed on the Preliminary Landmarks List. If that was not the action taken by the Commission, Mr. Karceski referenced an alternative proposal which his client could accept which would be to place only the oldest portion of the existing structure on the Preliminary Landmarks List with the flexibility to allow that structure to be moved elsewhere on the lot or elsewhere along Woodbrook Lane.

Mr. Brennan stated the Commission's responsibility is to judge the merits of the nomination and make a recommendation to the County Council but not to be involved with the development plans.

Mr. Karceski introduced Mr. Edward Brown, one of the owners of the property. Mr. Brown explained that he had lived on Woodbrook Lane for longer than any other current resident and provided a history of his family's connection and devotion to the area.

Mr. Steven Smith of Gaylord Brooks explained considerable time was spent working with members of the community. The final plans for the lot reflect agreements to limit the size of a structure to be allowed on the subject lot and an agreement to not re-configure the 2 existing storm water management facilities.

Architect, Mr. Larry Link, submitted a report for the Commission to consider which explained the multitude of reasons why he felt the structure was not a distinctive example of a Gothic Revival/Carpenter Gothic style building and not the work of a master builder.

Mr. Karceski submitted a plan for the Commission to consider as a representation of what could be a possibility if the original structure were placed on the Preliminary Landmarks

List and allowed to be moved elsewhere on the lot or elsewhere on Woodbrook Lane. He asked that should the Commission vote to support the nomination, they not delineate a Historic Environmental Setting. Mr. Link noted the original portion of the structure is labeled Part A on the material submitted.

Mr. Brennan recognized Mr. Scott Helm as having signed in to address the Commission. A resident of the neighborhood, Mr. Helm explained the nomination was in response to the unwarranted application to demolish the structure which was a violation of an existing agreement with the neighborhood to preserve it. He offered copies of materials reflecting the agreement reached between the Browns and the community for the existing structure to remain in place. Mr. Helm stated the Administrative Law Judge who heard the development case relied upon the materials for the purpose of rendering his decision.

Mr. Thaler asked if a readable copy of the final Development Plan was available.

Mr. Brennan noted the Commission was not charged with making a recommendation on the Development Plan.

Mr. Helm continued and indicated the cottage met two criteria for placement on the Preliminary Landmarks List which were its association with a person and/or place of local significance and as a distinctive example of a particular style. He expressed concerns that the structure would be demolished if it is not afforded protection by adding it to the Preliminary Landmarks List and urged the Commission to base their decision upon the information provided by staff and not a party hired to disagree.

Mr. Helm explained many supporters of the nomination were present and wished to be recognized.

Mr. Brennan asked those supporting the nomination to stand and be recognized.

Mr. Thaler asked Mr. Helm how long he has lived in the community, whether he lives in a new or old house and whether he was involved in the development process. Mr. Helm answered he has lived in one of the older homes for seven or eight years and was involved in private negotiations that took place before the development plan process.

Mr. Brennan recognized Mr. Sam Himmelrich and invited him to address the Commission. Mr. Himmelrich reported on both his professional experiences and personal affiliations which he drew upon in his decision to support the nomination. He expressed the opinion that additions to original structures become a part of the cumulative history of a property and thoughtful additions such as those present on this structure contribute to the historic nature of the building.

Ms. Alison Bernie, another resident of Woodbrook Lane, offered her support for the nomination and explained an on-line petition to save the cottage had received approximately 230 signatures and approximately 145 supporters had been recognized on a Face Book page created on behalf of the cottage.

Mr. John W. Michael, also a resident of Woodbrook Lane, noted that over the years, the process of selling lots and building houses resulted in few vestiges of the past remaining. He hoped that by supporting the nomination of the cottage, another reminder of the history of the area would be preserved.

Ms. Trish Bentz, representing The Preservation Alliance of Baltimore County, spoke in support of the nomination and suggested there are other options such as environmental easements which might protect and preserve the structure.

Having recognized all those present wishing to speak, Mr. Brennan asked if Commission Members wished to comment or ask questions.

Mr. Boswell indicated that he wanted the Commission to know that at least two Commission Members had come under outside pressure with regard to the nomination of this structure to the Preliminary Landmarks List. He continued to report that his long standing volunteer service to Baltimore County and his continuing tenure on the Commission had been linked to how he's to vote on this nomination. He indicated he would act according to the high standards of the Commission without outside interference and according to the law. Mr. Boswell stated County law is very clear as to the Commission's responsibilities and cites properties must meet any 1 of 5 specific criteria in order to be added to the Preliminary Landmarks List. He found that the law does not say properties favored by a community or political party shall receive special consideration.

Mr. Thaler explained that he feels as strongly as does Mr. Boswell for totally different reasons. He continued that he found this nomination to be a misuse of process and that he disagrees with Mr. Brennan's comments that the development process is not within the purview of the Commission. Mr. Thaler indicated that although the Final Development Plan indicates the house is to remain, the pattern book that accompanied the plan mentions it might not. He advised that the proper procedure for amending Final Development Plans is addressed via a public hearing before the Hearing Officer and is outlined in a document circulated during the meeting labeled 1b01.7b – Amendments after Sale of a Property.

Mr. Thaler stated that as a member of the development community, he finds nominations brought before the Commission late in the development process sends the message to property owners to tear down structures early before they begin a development process. He commented that the issue becomes bigger than this one house and believes that based on his experiences, nominations received late in the development process will result in 10 houses getting demolished in other instances.

Mr. Thaler proposed a compromise to support the nomination of the front portion of the subject house with the provision that it can be moved to become an accessory structure much like the plan Mr. Karceski provided and that moving the house and putting it back

together come back to the Commission in an effort to make sure it was done in an appropriate style.

Ms. Rising asked that the criteria for which the nomination would be supported be stated and reminded the Commission that a historic environmental setting must be delineated. After a discussion as to the requirement for a delineated setting, Mr. Rising pointed out that the County Council has the authority to amend the historic environmental setting recommended by the Commission.

Ms. Nevins-Hawks asked if any studies had been conducted to consider the possibility of putting a house on the lot while keeping the original. Mr. Karceski answered that to his knowledge, there had been none.

Mr. Thaler moved to vote to (a) place the front portion of the “Woodbrook Cottage” on the Preliminary Landmarks List under criteria (2) as an example of 19th century Carpenter Gothic architecture and (b) to delineate the parcel, .60 acres total (map 79, parcel 3, lot 4), as its historic environmental setting. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion which passed with Ms. Benton, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Mr. Syed, Mr. Thaler and Mr. Yaffe casting affirmative votes, Ms. Allen, Mr. Boswell, Ms. Nevins-Hawks, Ms. Horst and Mr. Myer voting against the motion and Mr. Kellman abstaining from the vote.

Citing County Code, Section 32-7-302.

Items for Discussion and Vote

5. Siegel property, 1010 Windsor Road, contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District, contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park National Register Historic District, MIHP #BA-3031; ex-post facto demolition of accessory structure [County Council District #2]

Ms. Rising reported this item involved a complaint received by Code Enforcement this past winter for the demolition of a garage without a permit or prior approval. The determination was made that the structure was removed without a historic or standard County building permit and a citation was issued.

Ms. Rising explained that regular maintenance of structures within County Historic Districts is required under Section 32-7-101 (g) to prevent demolition by neglect. She stated that documentation from the district’s creation in 1993 does not speak to the condition of the structure and additional survey material and photographs from 2002 does not suggest severe deterioration existed warranting demolition. The documentation however lacks specific structural details that attest to the physical integrity of the structure, therefore, staff was not able to ascertain conclusive information about the structure’s condition in order to meet a burden of proof that demonstrates the existence of demolition by neglect.

The property owner, Ms. Donna Siegel, was present and reported her insurance company dictated the structure be razed due to its poor condition.

Mr. Hord noted that whether or not demolition by neglect could be proved, the fact remains that an accessory structure within the boundaries of a County Historic District was demolished without prior approval of the Landmarks Preservation Commission and without a required standard county permit.

Mr. Hord asked Ms. Rising to explain what process would be followed should an ex-post facto approval for the demolition not be approved. Ms. Rising indicated the matter would be scheduled for a hearing before an Administrative Law Judge for the purpose of confirming a violation had been committed and staff would be asked to recommend a remedy for resolving the violation. Ms. Rising noted that typically, remedies are established in the form of a fine stated as a percentage of assessed property values. Mr. Hord suggested the remedy could be a requirement to rebuild the demolished structure.

Mr. Yaffe moved to vote to issue an Ex-post facto Notice to Proceed. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Allen, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Ms. Nevins-Hawks, Mr. Kellman, Mr. Myer, Mr. Syed, Mr. Thaler and Mr. Yaffe and dissenting votes being cast by Ms. Benton, Mr. Boswell, Ms. Horst and Mr. Hord.

Citing County Code, Section 32-7-403; Resolution Establishing Procedures & a Timeframe wherein violations to Section 32-7-403 of the Baltimore County Code must be corrected (adopted 10/15/08).

- **6. Bakondi property, 501 Stoneleigh Road, contributing structure in the Stoneleigh National Register Historic District; Part II approval for cleaning and painting both exterior siding and chimney [County Council District #5]

Approved via the Consent Agenda to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Citing County Code, Section 11-2-201 and Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Façade Materials, p. 7; Secretary of Interior's Standards #5, #6 & #7.

- **7. Davies property, 640 Murdock Road, contributing structure in the Anneslie National Register Historic District; Part II approval for the in-kind replacement of existing asphalt shingle roof and replacement of the existing central air conditioning condenser [County Council District #5]

Approved via the Consent Agenda to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Citing County Code, Sec. 11-2-201 and Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Roofs, p 10; Secretary of the Interior's Standards #4 & #5; National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, Preservation Brief #24 – Heating, Ventilating, and Cooling Historic Buildings – Problems and Recommended Approaches.

8. “Jessop House (Meadowvale)”, George property, 8606 Westford Road, Final Landmarks List #338; Part II approval for the repair of the existing master bath to include plumbing, painting, walks, floors and installation of a tub, sink and toilet [County Council District #3]

Ms. Rising indicated the proposal involves a tax credit application submitted for interior work involving the repair of an existing bathroom in a landmark structure. The property owner has indicated they plan to eventually submit a more extensive application for rehabilitation work. A technical committee consisting of Vicki Nevy, Steven Myer, Rob Brennan and Faith Nevins-Hawks had visited the site on April 27, 2016 to assess the condition of the structure and speak with the owner about various plans.

Mr. Hord moved to vote to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposal. Mr. Syed seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Allen, Ms. Benton, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Ms. Nevins-Hawks, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Mr. Kellman, Mr. Myer, Mr. Syed, Mr. Thaler and Mr. Yaffe and no dissenting votes being cast.

Citing Baltimore County Code, Section 11-2-201 and Secretary of the Interior’s Standard #6 & #10; National Park Services, Interpreting the Standards Bulletins – Interior alterations to Detached Residences to Accommodate New Functions.

9. “Mt. Welcome Retreat” and setting, Schlossnagle/Wu property, 3144 Granite Road, Final Landmarks List #244, MIHP #BA-0009; Part II approval for the in-kind replacement of existing fiberglass shingle roof (house and front entry porch roof), replacement of existing aluminum gutters and downspouts with half-round aluminum gutters and full round downspouts, repair of existing windows and doors, in-kind repair/replacement of existing wood trim, decorative balcony, piers, brackets, rails and shutters, stabilize/reset stone porch pier on south elevation, replace existing wood front entry porch floor decking with painted tongue and groove cedar porch flooring, re-point existing main house and chimney(s) stonework, extensive in-kind repair/paint of interior finishes to include ceilings/walls/floor/trim/doors/windows/hardware/stairs, installation of high efficiency oil furnace/flue/oil storage tank/air conditioning, removal of ductwork in attic stair hall, update electrical service as necessary, stabilize ruins on site and fence for safety, repair/replace/refinish floors/walls/ceilings of existing bathroom (1st floor south) and non-tax credit eligible proposals involving the removal of a portion of an interior wall for the purpose of enlarging a family room and proposal to convert two existing, non-original, 1 story additions to 2 story additions.

Mr. Brennan recused himself from the discussion and vote as his firm is involved in the project. Ms. Horst assumed the duties of the chairperson for this agenda item.

Ms. Rising reported the proposals involve both exterior alterations to a final landmarks structure and requests for tax credits to perform interior and exterior rehabilitation projects. Proposals also include stabilization of historic stone ruins and fencing on the property.

Ms. Rising explained the original house was constructed in the early 19th century and received a stone addition. She pointed out that the current entrance to the structure was originally the rear of the house and changes to some of the porches had been made over the years. She suggested some of the Commission members might remember visiting the property a few years ago when the setting was delineated in anticipation of similar proposals the previous owner had planned to undertake.

Ms. Rising indicated the new owners wish to address some of the deferred maintenance items that require attention and make changes to suit their family. She noted the proposed treatments are consistent with the Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. She elaborated that the stabilization of the slave structure will be conducted so that it has no adverse effect on the existing materials and will help prevent further deterioration or damage; the proposed interior configuration changes to the bathrooms will return interior spaces to their original configuration; the proposed changes to the interior walls on the basement level would be performed in a space that has already been altered and conducted so that the original sequence of spaces will be protected; the configuration of the walls are to be visible and remain in the same configuration as those above them on the first floor and the conversion of the existing 20th century non historic additions are designed so that they are compatible with the historic structure in height, massing, design and materials.

Ms. Horst determined the property owner, Mr. Schlossnagle, was present and available to answer any questions.

Mr. Yaffe asked if both staff and the owner of the property understood the specifics of the various proposals being made. Ms. Rising replied staff was very familiar with the property as a result of multiple site visits conducted over the years and have had many conversations with both the homeowner and his architect(s).

Mr. Diggs recalled visiting the site several years ago and moved to vote to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the various proposals. Mr. Thaler seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Allen, Ms. Benton, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Diggs, Ms. Nevins-Hawks, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Mr. Kellman, Mr. Myer, Mr. Syed, Mr. Thaler and Mr. Yaffe, no dissenting votes being cast and Mr. Brennan recusing himself from the vote.

Citing Baltimore County Code, Section 32-7-403; County Code, Section 11-2-201 and Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Windows & Doors, p. 2; Roofs, p. 8 & 11; Porches & Steps, pp. 3-4; Façade Materials, pp. 8-9; Additions & Infill, pp. 3-4, & 6; Fences & Landscapes, p. 1; National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, Preservation Brief # 24 - Heating, Ventilating, and Cooling Historic Buildings—Problems and Recommended Approaches; National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, Preservation Brief # 18 - Rehabilitating Interiors in Historic Buildings: Identifying and Preserving Character-Defining Elements.

- **10. “Thompson House”, Frederick property, 223 Morris Avenue, contributing structure in the Lutherville County Historic District and Lutherville National Register Historic District, MIHP #BA-0318; replacement of a non-original greenhouse window with a wood, six over six, true divided light window to match existing windows located elsewhere on the house and re-installation of original shutters [County Council District #3]

Approved via the Consent Agenda to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Citing Baltimore County Code, Section 32-7-403 and Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Windows & Doors, pp. 6-7.

- **11. Hart property 317 Hopkins Road, contributing structure in the Rodgers Forge National Register Historic District; Part II approval for the installation of a central air conditioning system [County Council District #5]

Approved via the Consent Agenda to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Citing Baltimore County Code, Section 11-2-201 and Secretary of the Interior’s Standards #4 & #5; National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, Preservation Brief #24 – Heating, Ventilating, and Cooling Historic Buildings – Problems and Recommended Approaches.

12. “White-Colvin House” (Matthew Yates, Jr. House), 1407 Clarkview Road LLC property, 6242 Falls Road, Final Landmarks List #258, contributing structure in the Bare Hills National Register Historic District, MIHP #BA-3244; ex-post facto replacement of existing roof with asphalt shingle roofing [County Council District #2]

Ms. Rising reported Code Enforcement visited the property and issued a correction notice in response to work being conducted without a historic permit. The project manager responded and filed a historic permit application for the in-kind replacement of the roof. Ms. Rising noted this type of work would not generally require a Baltimore County building permit which may have contributed to the confusion over which type of permit may have been required.

Mr. Boswell explained that last fall he noticed demolition work was being done at the property and was able to ascertain the work was being done without a permit being obtained. At the time, he reported the matter to staff but was not personally able to pursue the matter further. Mr. Boswell indicated that when he recently noticed on-going work, he stopped and spoke with the construction manager on site who informed him no permit had been obtained. Upon determining no permit had been obtained, Mr. Boswell reported the matter to Code Enforcement.

Mr. Boswell noted he feels that work being undertaken at the property is haphazard in nature and reflects a general disrespect for the structure’s historic designation. He commented that the project however does not warrant the owner being cited for a

violation and he did offer support for staff's recommendation to vote to issue an Ex-post facto Certificate of Appropriateness.

In response to Mr. Thaler's request for a description of the structure's historical significance, Ms. Rising reiterated that the structure is on the Final Landmarks List as one of the few remaining structures in the "Scott Settlement" community which is one of Baltimore County's oldest, pre-Civil War communities of free African-Americans and is considered a contributing structure to the Bare Hills National Register Historic District.

Mr. Thaler moved to vote to issue an Ex-post facto Certificate of Appropriateness. Mr. Yaffe seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Allen, Ms. Benton, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Ms. Nevins-Hawks, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Mr. Kellman, Mr. Myer, Mr. Syed, Mr. Thaler and Mr. Yaffe. No dissenting votes were cast.

Citing Baltimore County Code Section 32-7-403; Resolution Establishing Procedures & a Timeframe wherein violations to Section 32-7-403 of the Baltimore County Code must be corrected (adopted 10/15/08) and Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Roofs, p. 10.

13. Brennan property, 102 Rosewood Avenue, contributing structure in the Old Catonsville National Register Historic District; Part II approval for the installation of an air conditioning system [County Council District #1]

Mr. Brennan recused himself from the discussion and vote for this project. Ms. Horst assumed the duties of the chairperson for this agenda item.

Ms. Rising indicated Part II applications such as this would customarily be part of the Consent Agenda, however, due to the homeowner's relationship to the Commission, it was not part of the meeting's Consent Agenda.

Mr. Thaler moved to vote to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the proposal. Mr. Syed seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Allen, Ms. Benton, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Diggs, Ms. Nevins-Hawks, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Mr. Kellman, Mr. Myer, Mr. Syed, Mr. Thaler and Mr. Yaffe, no dissenting votes being cast and Mr. Brennan recusing himself from the vote.

Citing Baltimore County Code, Section 11-2-201 and Secretary of the Interior's Standards #4 & #5; National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, Preservation Brief #24 – Heating, Ventilating, and Cooling Historic Buildings – Problems and Recommended Approaches.

- **14. "Welsh House". Burgess property, 224 & 226 Central Avenue, contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District and Glyndon National Register Historic District, MIHP #BA-0793; in-kind replacement of an existing asphalt shingle roof [County Council District #3]

Approved via the Consent Agenda to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Citing Baltimore County Code, Section 32-7-403 and Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Roofs, p. 10.

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

Leonard property, 303 Murdock Road, contributing structure in the Rodgers Forge National Register Historic District; installation of central air conditioning system and repair/replacement of plaster ceilings [County Council District #5]

Other Business

Ms. Rising reminded the Commission that last October a plan to moth ball Shaw's Discovery had been put forth by a Technical Committee in an effort to secure the building. At the time, the owners agreed to the Technical Committee revisiting the site for the purposes of determining the structure's condition in six months. The Technical Committee recently reconvened and made a few recommendations for the continuing care of the vacant structure. The owners, through their representative, Ms. Patsy Malone, agreed to the recommendations. All parties agreed to revisit the site in another 6 months for the purposes of re-evaluating the structure's condition.

Ms. Rising reported efforts to plan and schedule the annual Spring Retreat are on-going and details will be circulated once the date and location are confirmed.

Mr. Thaler moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Myer seconded the motion, with affirmative votes being cast by Ms. Allen, Ms. Benton, Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Ms. Nevins Hawks, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Mr. Kellman, Mr. Myer, Mr. Syed, Mr. Thaler and Mr. Yaffe. There were no dissenting votes cast.

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

VKN:vkn