

**Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission**  
**September 12<sup>th</sup>, 2024 Meeting Minutes**

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

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

Present

Mr. Daniel Dean  
Ms. Phoebe Evans Letocha  
Ms. Jamie Ferguson  
Mr. Scott Holupka  
Mr. John Holman, Chair  
Mr. Ed Hord, Vice-Chair  
Mr. Tom Liebel  
Ms. Wendy McIver  
Mr. Christopher Parts  
Mr. Christopher Weston

Not Present

Mr. Vincent Johnson  
Ms. Lili Mundroff

Attending County staff included Ms. Caitlin Merritt (Preservation Services Chief), Ms. Jessica Brannock (Preservation Planner), and Mr. Jeffery Utermohle (Office of Law).

**SPECIAL PRESENTATION**

*Sila Residence National Register Nomination*

“Sila Residence,” 1801 Indian Head Road Towson, Maryland. MIHP # BA-3360. Special Presentation on National Register Nomination [County Council District #2].

Ms. Merritt delivered the following presentation on the Sila Residence and its historic significance based on the National Register Form that was included in the Commission’s meeting materials. The property meets the following criteria:

Criterion A (*associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad pattern of our history*) in the area of Social History as the work of women architects in Maryland under the historic context *Women Architects in Maryland During the Postwar Era, 1945 to 1970*.

The Sila Residence, designed for Dr. Bari Sila and Dr. Ulgan Sila by Turkish architect Nezahat Arikoğlu in conjunction with her husband and design partner, Ilhan Arikoğlu, is a highlight in Maryland’s collection of modern buildings due to its unique blend of contemporary Turkish and American design features. Nezahat Arikoğlu was one of only a handful of women architects active in both Maryland and the country during the twentieth century; therefore, her work represents a perspective within the landscape of modern architecture previously unseen. Arikoğlu and other women in the field helped establish a more equitable environment within the architectural profession and their stories form part of the broader social history of women’s

efforts to achieve greater equality within American society. Criterion B (Property associated with the lives of persons significant in our past):

Criterion C (Property embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction or represents the work of a master, or possesses high artistic values, or represents a significant and distinguishable entity whose components lack individual distinction):

As a distinctive example of a well-designed mid-century modern dwelling indicative of the trends that shaped modern residential design after World War II.

Ms. Evans Letocha moved to approve to recommend the Sila Residence to the National Register of Historic Places based on the criteria presented in the National Register nomination. Mr. Hord seconded the motion. Affirmative votes were cast by Mr. Dean, Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Liebel, Ms. McIver, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

**1. Review of the Agenda**

Ms. Brannock reported there were no changes made to the Preliminary Agenda published September 5<sup>th</sup>, 2024.

**2. Approval of the Minutes**

Mr. Holman asked if anyone proposed changes to the July 11<sup>th</sup>, 2024 Minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Holman called for a motion. Mr. Liebel moved to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Holupka seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative voice votes being cast by Mr. Dean, Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Liebel, Ms. McIver, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

**3. Consent Agenda**

Ms. Brannock read the Action Recommendations for Consent Agenda Items 4, 7, 8, and 9.

Mr. Holman asked if anyone wished to discuss the Consent Agenda Items further. Hearing none, Mr. Holman called for a motion. Mr. Liebel moved to approve the Consent Agenda items as proposed. Mr. Weston seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Dean, Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Liebel, Ms. McIver, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

**Items for Discussion and Vote**

- \*\*4.** “Monde Property” 1554 South Rolling Road, Relay. Contributing resource within the Relay County Historic District. Part II approval to return the transom above the front entry [County Council District #1].

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

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 2. Windows & Doors. Code Sec. 11-2- 201; and 32-7-405.*

- 5.** “Malgran” Property, 708 Cliveden Road W, Sudbrook Park. Contributing resource within the Sudbrook Park County Historic District. Removal of existing rear walkways, patio and entry steps and construction of a new deck landing and patio [County Council District #2].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved the removal of the existing rear walkways, patio, and entry steps, and the construction of a new deck landing and patio. Ms. Brannock shared that the property is a 2 and ½ frame dwelling with a cross-gambrel roof constructed in 1895, in the “shingle-style.” The applicant requested to make several improvements to the rear entry and patio area. Ms. Brannock noted that the rear steps, walkways and patio area are not original/historic features of the home. The work included the following:

1. Removal of existing steps, patio area, and walkways. Level and prep the surrounding ground.
2. Construction of a new, “L-shaped” 204 sq ft deck to create a landing between the two rear entry doors. The deck landing will be with 6x6 “extreme treated” wood with concrete footing and extend from the house 10’ on the right side and 6’ on the left. New wood steps will be constructed along the entire width will lead down from the landing to the new proposed patio.
3. The installation of a new 16’x17’ paver patio at the base of the new deck and stairs. Belgar pavers in the color “Light Brown Mix” will be laid.
4. Laying new walkways in the same locations, using the same Belgar pavers.

Ms. Brannock introduced the property owner, Mr. Daniel Malgran. Mr. Malgran agreed with Staff’s summary and thanked the Commission.

The Commission had no further discussion or questions.

Mr. Parts exited the meeting.

Mr. Weston moved to approve the removal of the existing rear walkways, patio, and entry steps, and the construction of a new deck landing and patio, as proposed. Mr. Dean seconded the motion. Affirmative votes were cast by Mr. Dean, Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Liebel, Ms. McIver, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 5. Porches & Steps. County Code Sec. 32-7-405.*

**6.** “Smith Property”, 502 Upland Road, Sudbrook Park. Non-contributing resource within the Sudbrook Park County Historic District. Street front parking pad [County Council District #2].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved the construction of a street front parking pad. Ms. Brannock shared that the property at 502 Upland Road is a split-level, shed-style dwelling constructed in 1947, and is a non-contributing structure within the Sudbrook Park County Historic District. On August 5, 2024, Preservation Services staff was informed of active grading along the roadway at 502 Upland Road, with the presumed intent to install a new parking pad. Staff contacted the property owner with instructions to submit a historic review application for the proposed work. A Code Violation has not been issued.

The applicants proposed to install a new 6’ x 24’ asphalt parking pad along the front of the property on Upland Road. The proposed parking pad does not connect to the existing driveway and will widen the street to allow for more room for street parking.

Additionally, the owners proposed crushed gravel or natural stone as alternative options. The application noted that the front yard slopes approximately ~90 degrees toward Upland Road, where stormwater collects and makes parking difficult. The work will include continued grading at roughly ~5-10 degrees along the sloped front yard.

The application did not include any information about if there will be a low retaining wall or border along the property side. Staff asked the Commission to clarify any additional details about the design of the parking area that are lacking from the “site plan.”

While staff did not necessarily have an issue with creating more functional parking, they felt that it would be more appropriate and aesthetically pleasing to have the new parking area connect to the existing driveway, or to expand the existing driveway. Widening the current driveway will help preserve the streetscape, and make the additional parking cohesive with what exists on the site. The current proposal has the potential to disrupt the Olmsted plan of curvilinear tree-lined streets, which makes Sudbrook Park significant for its landscape design. Our design guidelines state that new parking areas may be appropriate if the design is in keeping with existing circulation routes, and the design complements the primary structure and/or historic district.

Staff asked the Commission to discuss the location of the proposed parking area, and its potential impact to the streetscape, and to discuss any alternatives.

Additionally, as Upland Road is a County maintained roadway, Staff inquired at the Department of Public Works if any additional approvals would be needed to create a new “curb” cut. As of September 12<sup>th</sup>, Staff is still waiting on a response.

Ms. Brannock introduced the property owner, Ms. Mandy Smith. Ms. Smith reiterated the difficulty in accommodating parking for medical staff to provide at-home-care for a family member who resides at the property. She continued that the sloped front yard and poor drainage causes mud and storm water to collect along Upland Road where street parking is available. The Smith’s previously explored expanding the existing driveway, however, existing utility lines are located to the immediate left of the driveway, and would need to be rerouted.

Mr. Weston asked if there are other examples of street-front parking pads in the historic district. Ms. Smith replied that there are no existing parking pads on Upland Road, and that some neighbors park on the grass, but there are others present in the district.

Discussion continued on the materials the applicant will need to include in resubmission, which included a detailed site plan drawn to scale, with the location of utilities labeled, and more information about the design and transition from the yard to parking area. Mr. Holman added that the Department of Public Works may also require technical drawings.

Mr. Hord moved to not approve the parking pad installation, as proposed. Ms. Evans Letocha seconded the motion. Affirmative votes were cast by Mr. Dean, Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Liebel, Ms. McIver, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Fences and Landscape: 1-10. County Code Sec. 32-7-405.*

- \*\*7.** “Hoing Property” (Planters Paradise), 2316 Bauernschmidt Rd, Essex. Final landmark # 110 - PLANTER'S PARADISE/BAUERNHURST& SETTING. Part II approval for in-kind replacements to the porch gutters, porch roof, screen-doors and porch railings; and the replacement of AC unit [County Council District #7].

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

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Fences and Landscape: 1-10. County Code Sec. 32-7-405.*

- \*\*8.** “Beverley Property”, 16202 Corbett Village Lane, Monkton. Contributing resource within the Corbett County Historic District. Part II approval for an in-kind architectural asphalt shingle roof replacement [County Council District #3].

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

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter. Roofs County Code Sec. 11-2- 201; and 32-7-405.*

- \*\*9.** “DAVENPORT HOUSE”, Mitchell Property, 2101 Mount Carmel Road, Parkton. Final Landmarks List #376. DAVENPORT HOUSE (BELLEVIEW) BANK BARN, BARN, WAGON HOUSE, GARDEN HOUSE & SETTING. Part II approval for repairs and in-kind replacements to the historic corner crib (wagon house [County Council District #3].

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

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 3. Roofs: 1-12, Chapter 4. Exterior Walls & Foundations: 1-19, County Code Sec. 11-2- 201; and 32-7-405.*

- 10.** “Costa Property”, 16223 Corbett Village Lane, Monkton. Contributing resource within the Corbett County Historic District. Ex-post facto review of 2-story accessory structure Code Enforcement Correction Notice/Stop work # CB2300746 [County Council District #3].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved the ex-post facto review of 2-story accessory structure Code Enforcement Correction Notice/Stop work # CB2300746. Ms. Brannock provided the following summary of the code enforcement case: Historic Preservation Staff was contacted on November 23, 2023, and was informed of the construction of a 2-story garage on the property without LPC review and without a Building Permit. Subsequently, a Stop Work order was issued by Code Enforcement on December 1, 2023, with instructions to contact our office.

The applicants came before the LPC at the March 14th meeting seeking an ex-post facto review of the partially constructed 2-story, 26’ by 48’, with a height of 30’, accessory structure, with a 4-car garage, and gym/office space on the upper floors. The LPC denied the request citing that the size and design of the structure did not meet our design guidelines.

The applicants returned to the Commission at its May 5th meeting with revised plans. The location and overall footprint remained the same, but the following changes were made:

- The overall height was lowered, from 30’ to 21’11”
- The front roof elevation had three dormers – Dormer style inspired from main house
- The window sizes are smaller and more compatible with the main house
- The style of windows, changed from large picture windows to 2/2 sash windows to be more consistent with those on the main house
- Entry door style has been changed to match the carriage style garage doors.

Again, the LPC voted to not approve the request and asked the applicants to return resubmission that addresses the concerns voiced at the meeting particularly the size and height.

The current proposal included the following:

- The location and footprint remain the same size at 26' by 48'.
- Reducing the current height from 30' to 19'7", making the structure 1 ½ stories with a saltbox roof.
- There will be parking for 2 cars and fitness/recreation area on the first floor and storage space on the upper floor.
- The previous awning and balcony have been removed.
- The side elevations will have a single-entry door, and two windows in the attic story.
- There will be three evenly spaced gable dormers on the front roof elevation; and two, double, carriage-style garage doors.
- The roof will be covered with standing seam metal and the walls will have vertical hardie board siding.
- The proposed window style is similar to those on the primary dwelling - 2 over 2 sash.
- Additionally, the applicant plans to plant more trees along their side yard to buffer any views to the structure

Staff asked the Commission to consider the design, type of village, or overall village plan, and the property's size and location within the entire historic district, and its overall visibility.

Ms. Brannock continued that Staff felt that with the lower proposed roof height and additional tree plantings the visual impact of the accessory structure will be greatly diminished from the rest of the district.

Our guidelines mention that new accessory structures should be sited in rear yards AND generally, depending on the size of the property, an accessory structure's size should be compatible with, and have a smaller footprint than the primary dwelling.

Staff noted that the applicant had sufficiently addressed some of the concerns that their community and the LPC, had.

Ms. Brannock concluded her comments and asked the Commission to consider the changes and information staff noted in their report, and to determine if they better align with our guidelines.

Ms. Merritt announced that five written testimonies in support, and twelve written testimonies in opposition of the accessory structure were submitted, and were circulated to the Commission prior to the meeting. Ms. Merritt continued that the comments in the written testimonies echoed concerns voiced by the speakers regarding the height, size, intended use, and compatibility of the structure with the Historic District.

Ms. Brannock introduced the first speaker, Mr. Andrew Clemens, a former resident of Corbett Village. Mr. Clemens reiterated concerns about the size of the structure and location of the two sets of garage doors that could potentially allow for use as a four-vehicle garage (staff noted that the intended use of a structure is not within the purview of the LPC). Mr. Clemens continued that he felt the second-story dormers were unnecessary.

Ms. Brannock introduced Ms. Kristiina Altman, a resident of Corbett Village. Ms. Altman summarized the compilation of historic accessory structures she previously submitted to the Commission to provide context on existing structures within the district. Ms. Altman noted that most accessory structures are small utility sheds, and are a fraction of the size of the Costa's proposed accessory structure. Ms. Altman

continued that she felt that the design is not compatible with the historic district, and that the four proposed garage-doors do not match the door style of rural accessory structures.

Ms. Brannock introduced Mr. John MacFarlane, a resident of Corbett Village. Mr. MacFarlane submitted written testimony that was circulated to the Commission. Mr. MacFarlane addressed neighborhood concerns and the visibility of the structure from the NCR trail and Corbett Village Lane.

Ms. Brannock introduced Ms. Barbara MacFarlane, a resident of Corbett Village. Ms. MacFarlane summarized key points of the previous reviews of the structure, and raised concern that the overall size has not been significantly reduced in its third submission. Ms. MacFarlane expressed concern for the precedent that would be set if the Commission approved a structure that was partially constructed prior to receiving the necessary permits and LPC approval.

Ms. Brannock introduced Mr. Don Yocham, a resident of Corbett Village. Mr. Yocham expressed his support for the structure and noted that large, 2-story accessory structures can be found throughout the historic district, and are present on his own property.

Ms. Brannock introduced the property owners, Mr. Nate Costa, Ms. Gina Costa, and their surveyor, Mr. Bruce Doaks. Mr. Doak described his familiarity with the processes to obtain a Zoning variance for the height of the structure, and recommended that the Commission approve the updated plans, as proposed. Mr. Costa stated that the new plans consider the Commission's previous recommendations to reduce the height of the structure from two stories, to 1 ½ stories. He added that the maximum height of the upper level would be 6' and would be used as a storage space (staff noted that the Commission does not have purview over the intended use of a structure). Mr. Costa continued that the structure was reduced from a four-vehicle to two-vehicle garage, and the proposed deck was removed. Mr. Costa thanked staff and the Commission for their guidance throughout the historic review process.

Ms. Evans Letocha initiated discussion on the overall height and size of the structure. The general consensus among the Commission was that the structure and footprint were still too large. The Commission determined that a Technical Committee be formed to conduct a site visit.

Mr. Hord moved to not approve the continued construction of the accessory structure, as proposed, and to form a technical committee to further assess the structure. Ms. McIver seconded the motion. Affirmative votes were cast by Mr. Dean, Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Liebel, Ms. McIver, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

*Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, New Construction, Additions, & Non-Contributing Structures. County Code Sec. 32-7-405.*

### **To Be Reported**

Ms. Brannock reported that the following historic review applications/Part II tax credit applications were approved by staff as an emergency repair or due to the receipt of Part II approval for work reviewed by Maryland Historic Trust:

- “Fisher Property” 212 Hopkins Road, Towson. Contributing resource within the Rodgers Forge National Register Historic District. Part II approval for a new HVAC system, in-kind gutter, and downspout installations [County Council District #6].
- “Scott Property” 315 Central Ave, Glyndon. Contributing resource within the Glyndon County Historic District. Part II approval for the refinishing of the original pine flooring [County Council District #4].

- “Watkins Patoka Property” 709 Cliveden Road, Sudbrook Park. Contributing resource within the Sudbrook Park County Historic District. Part II approval for in-kind repairs and replacements to the sewer waste line [County Council District #2]
- “Joice Property” 518 Murdock Road, Towson. Contributing resource within the Anneslie National Register Historic District. Part II approval for in-kind roof and gutter replacements [County Council District #6].
- “Morgan Property” 637 Murdock Road, Towson. Contributing resource within the Anneslie National Register Historic District. Part II approval for repairs to the main-house sewer [County Council District #6].
- “McClung Property”, 1604 S Rolling Road, Relay. Contributing resource within the Relay County Historic District. Part II approval for vinyl window replacements [County Council District #1].
- “Stuiber Property”, 901 Old Oak Road, Towson. Contributing resource within the Stoneleigh National Register Historic District. Part II approval for Exterior painting and siding repairs to the main house and garage, slate roof repairs, window repairs, and canvas awning replacement. Hardwood flooring refinishing, interior painting, bathroom and basement repairs, and HVAC replacement [County Council District #6].

### **Other Business**

Next meeting October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2024.

Mr. Hord moved to adjourn the meeting, which passed with affirmative voice votes being cast by Mr. Dean, Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Liebel, Ms. McIver, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

The meeting adjourned at 8:56 PM.

JCB:jcb