

Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission
October 10th, 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. Vincent Johnson
Mr. Tom Liebel
Ms. Wendy McIver
Ms. Lili Mundroff
Mr. Christopher Parts

Not Present

Mr. Christopher Weston

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

1. Review of the Agenda

Ms. Brannock reported there were no changes made to the Preliminary Agenda published October 3, 2024.

2. Approval of the Minutes

Mr. Holman asked if anyone proposed changes to the September 12th, 2024 Minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Holman called for a motion. Mr. Hord moved to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Parts seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative voice votes being cast by Mr. Dean, Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Liebel, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

3. Consent Agenda

Ms. Brannock read the Action Recommendations for Consent Agenda, Items 4 and 5.

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

Items for Discussion and Vote

- **4.** “Black – Clark” Property, 110 Dunkirk Road, Towson. Contributing resource within the Rodgers Forge National Register Historic District. Part II approval for slate roof repairs and in-kind replacements [County Council District #6].

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

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Roofs: 1-13. County Code Sec. 11-2- 201; and 32-7- 405.

- **5.** “O’Conor Property”, 210 Melancthon Ave, Lutherville. Non-contributing resource within the Lutherville County Historic District. 10’x12’ shed construction in the rear yard [County Council District #3].

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

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 6: New Construction, Additions, & Non-Contributing Structures. County Code Sec. 32-7-405

- 6.** “Ko-Pen Wang Trustee” Property, 10899 York Road, Cockeysville. Final Landmarks List #24. COCKEY HOMESTEAD. Various exterior repairs, in-kind replacements and construction of side and rear addition [County Council District #3].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved various exterior repairs, in-kind replacements and the construction of a side and rear addition.

Ms. Brannock shared that the property at 10899 York Road was locally designated as Final Landmark #24. COCKEY HOMESTEAD through Council Bill No. 101-78 in 1978. The structure is a five by two bay stone dwelling with a gable roof. The designation does not include a historic environmental setting.

The applicants proposed to construct a side (north) and rear (east) addition in order to accommodate future office space. The existing main house roof is a faux slate material. The applicants proposed to replace the entire existing roof with natural Del Carmen Slate shingles. The roofs of the new additions will be differentiated from the primary structure with standing seam copper roofs.

The applicant also proposed to make several repairs and in-kind replacements to the existing stone dwelling. Stone will be repointed as necessary with Ecologic lime mortar, and existing lap siding will be replaced in kind. Existing shutters will be replaced in kind with Timberland panel shutters. Existing windows will remain.

The north side addition will join the historic rear ell addition of the primary structure and connect to/ and incorporate the existing stone accessory structure (garage), using the existing patio between the house and the garage as its foundation. It will be considerably set back from the primary façade of the main block and have a lower roofline. The addition will be two stories tall and have Hardie fiber cement siding on the first-floor entry and Hardie fiber cement board and batten with a 4” exposure will be used on the second story. The windows will be a 6-over-6 style to match the main dwelling.

The rear addition will be constructed above the existing rear single-story sunroom, and will not include any changes to the existing rear foundation. The swimming pool in the rear yard will be filled and graded. The rear addition will be accessed from an entry on the second level, which will be at grade due to the natural slope of the rear yard. The addition will have a copper standing seam roof, and Traditional Double

Hung windows to match the existing. The addition will be clad in Hardie fiber cement siding to match the side addition.

Ms. Brannock shared that Staff appreciated the well designed and thought-out plans for the addition. The side and rear alterations meet our guidelines for additions. The additions are appropriately located and have appropriate material and product choices. The side addition is set back from the front building line and is attached to a rear ell addition, and incorporates the stone and foundations of the existing garage.

Ms. Brannock concluded her comments and asked that the Commission review the proposal and then approve, or modify accordingly.

Ms. Brannock introduced the project representative, Mr. David Smith. Mr. Smith stated that he is available for questions and described the current state of property.

Ms. Evans Letocha asked for clarity on whether the property has a historic environmental setting in place, and if the existing garage structure is included in the Landmark designation. Ms. Merritt replied that the Landmark status was placed on the primary dwelling, and that it does not include a historic setting, or any outbuildings in its designation.

Mr. Hord expressed satisfaction with the design and noted that the return of natural slate to the primary roof pitches, and copper standing seam to the addition roofs are appropriate choices.

The Commission agreed with Mr. Hord's comments and had no further questions or discussion.

Mr. Parts moved to approve the exterior repairs, in-kind replacements, and construction of side and rear addition, as proposed. Mr. Hord seconded the motion. Affirmative votes were cast by Mr. Dean, Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Liebel, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 6. New Construction, Additions, & Non-Contributing Structures. County Code Sec. 32-7-405.

7. "Smith Property", 502 Upland Road, Sudbrook Park. Non-contributing resource within the Sudbrook Park County Historic District. Existing rear driveway expansion or permeable street-front parking pad installation [County Council District #2].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which concerned the expansion of the existing rear asphalt driveway, and the installation of a permeable street-front parking pad. Ms. Brannock reminded the Commission 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.

Ms. Brannock continued that the property owner came before the Commission at its September 12, 2024 meeting, and proposed to install a new 6' x 24' asphalt parking pad along the front of the property on Upland Road. The proposed parking pad did not connect to the existing driveway and would widen the street to allow for more room for street parking. The Commission voted not to approve the request and asked for additional information regarding the design.

Since the September meeting, Staff confirmed with zoning regulations in regards to front yard parking. The proposed location of the parking pad is in the County's right of way, and would technically require a "residential access" permit for its installation. Unfortunately, since the property already has a driveway, the County would not be able to issue a permit or allow a parking pad to be installed.

The property owner has returned to the Commission with two proposals for additional parking. The first is the 6' x 24' street-front parking pad, with either a pea gravel, decorative stone, or "Turfstone" Brand Permeable Paver installation instead of asphalt. There is no border or retaining wall proposed in the location.

The second proposal is to add an 8' x 8' parking area to the existing rear parking area at the end driveway next to the garage, in the rear yard. This proposal's location is not visible from the road and doesn't disrupt the streetscape on Upland Road.

Ms. Brannock concluded her comments and asked that the Commission review both options and determine if the proposal met our design guidelines, and which option is the most appropriate for the district as a whole.

Mr. Hord stated that the proposed rear parking pad is an appropriate choice and could be expanded beyond the proposed 8' x 8' to accommodate multiple vehicles. Mr. Hord continued that the graded area should be covered in topsoil and sodded to return the yard to its previous condition.

Mr. Dean and Mr. Liebel reiterated Mr. Hord's comments that the rear driveway expansion is the most appropriate option and consistent with the design guidelines.

Mr. Hord moved to approve the expansion of the existing rear asphalt driveway, as proposed; and to not approve the installation of a street-front parking pad, and to return the front yard to its previous conditions. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Dean, Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Liebel, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, 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.

8. "Estate of Gail Rogers" Property, 501 Bond Ave, Reisterstown. Final Landmark #105. PRICE HOUSE (FREESE HOUSE. Ex-post facto review of various exterior alterations – Code Enforcement Correction Notice # CB1600086 [County Council District #2].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item, which involved the ex-post facto review of various exterior alterations, Code Enforcement Correction Notice # CB1600086.

The Price (Fresse) House was constructed in the late 19th century, in the Folk Victorian style, with various cross gable remnants of Downing and Vaux cottages. The house was added to the Final landmarks list in 1991 for its architecture and material integrity.

The property was purchased in April 2022 by Lauchman Real Estate Corp and EK Homes, LLC who made major renovations to the interior and exterior, subsequently putting the house on the market in November 2022. As a reminder, the violation came to Staff's attention from a constituent inquiry and subsequently a correction notice was issued on November 22, 2022. Violations included work completed without the approval of the LPC and permits for that work. Work completed included the replacement of

previously existing windows, enclosing several original window openings on the front, side and rear elevations; alterations of the size and placement of window openings, and the replacement of the front door.

The property at 501 Bond Ave last came before the Commission in January 2023 to address the issue of various exterior alterations completed without LPC approval and without permits. The LPC denied the application citing that the work completed did not meet our design guidelines and asked the owners to return to the commission with more details, and to focus on returning the front elevation back to its previous state.

The property was then sold to Gail Rogers in February 2023 with the active code violations. The property failed to return to the Commission and a citation was issued in September 2023. At the Administrative Law Judge hearing, the Judge issued fines and lien on the property in December 2023. The judge's final order stated that the violators Lauchman Real Estate Corp and EK Homes, LLC were at fault and ordered that the exterior be returned to the appearance at which it existed at the time it received Final Landmark designation, or as determined by the LPC.

Since then, the new property owner, Gail Rogers has passed away, and the property is now owned by her estate and cannot be sold until the code issues are satisfied.

Ms. Rodgers' daughter, Leslie Minchew, serves as the estate administrator, and has submitted an application to address the violations made by the previous owners. The alterations focus on the front elevation, as it is the most visible and prominent elevation. The proposal includes returning several architectural features that were removed from the house. The proposal does not address the front door replacements and alterations to the windows. It was noted that window alterations would impact several interior issues.

The proposed work items were as follows:

Work Item 1: Sunbursts (attic story gables)

These features do not currently exist. They were removed by a previous owner for restoration and were never returned. The applicant proposed to return the sunburst detail to the gable ends and match as closely possible using photographs that were provided by Staff to match. Their dimensions would be 58" on each side, made from plywood and painted.

Work Item 2. Porch Brackets

Recreate, as closely as possible, lace-like corner and center brackets, and install on front porch (front and side elevations). There will be 16 corner brackets, and nine (9) center brackets. The corner bracket dimensions are 16 3/4" x 14 1/2" x 12", and 2 3/4" wide. The center bracket dimensions will be 14" long and 6" high at deepest point. Both would be made from Spanish cedar and painted.

Work Item 3. Attic story gable end siding

The applicant requested to remove the current vinyl siding, and return cedar shingles back to the space to match the existing house. Will be painted to match.

Work Item 4. Shutters

Per 2016 photos, the windows of the front facade of the house had shutters (except for the middle window of the 3rd floor, this feature no longer exists). The applicant requested to return full louvre wooden shutters at all windows of front facade, except the middle window on the 3rd floor. Shutter dimensions are 60' tall x 19.5" wide (all windows are 60'x 38"), and will be pine. Shutters will be hung on historically appropriate, functional hinges, and held open with appropriate hardware.

Staff noted that all of the proposed items meet our design guidelines, and are appropriate to return to the house. Staff asked that the Commission review the items and current situation regarding the property, and determine if the proposed items are enough to satisfy the code violation.

Mr. Johnson exited the meeting due to technical issues.

Ms. Brannock introduced the estate administrator, Ms. Leslie Minchew. Ms. Minchew stated that she is available for questions.

Mr. Hord opened discussion and stated that he agreed with the decision of the Administrative Law Judge to return the façade to its previous conditions, prior to the unapproved alterations. Mr. Hord continued that the new, misaligned windows have disrupted the visual quality of the historic structure, and asked that the applicant provide more detailed, updated drawings in their resubmission.

Discussion on the window and front porch step alignments, sunburst gable details, porch windows, primary entry door, and character defining features of the primary façade continued.

Ms. Evans Letocha moved not to approve the alterations, as proposed. Ms. McIver seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast Mr. Dean, Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Hord, Mr. Liebel, Ms. McIver, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

The Commission asked that the applicant return with an application that focuses on the front façade and includes the window alterations and front door replacement.

Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines, Chapter 4. Exterior Walls & Foundations. County Code Sec. 32-7-405.

Other Business

The LPC will hold their last meeting of the year on November 14, 2024. Application submissions are due by October 31, 2024.

There is no meeting in December.

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, Ms. Mundroff, Mr. Parts, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

The meeting adjourned at 6:50 PM.

JCB:jcb