

**Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission  
November 14<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. Tom Liebel  
Ms. Wendy McIver  
Mr. Christopher Parts  
Mr. Christopher Weston

Not Present

Mr. Ed Hord, Vice-Chair  
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).

**1. Review of the Agenda**

Ms. Brannock reported there were no changes made to the Preliminary Agenda published November 7, 2024.

**2. Approval of the Minutes**

Mr. Holman asked if anyone proposed changes to the October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2024 Minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Holman called for a motion. Mr. Parts moved to approve the Minutes as drafted. Ms. Mundroff seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative voice votes being cast by Mr. Dean, Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Liebel, Ms. McIver, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. There were no dissenting votes.

**Items for Discussion and Vote**

**3. “Perry Hall School” (Parkville Enterprises Inc. Property) 9317 Belair Road, Perry Hall. Public Hearing on Nomination to the Preliminary Landmarks List – “Perry Hall School” [County Council District #5].**

Ms. Merritt introduced the nomination and presented the following history of the property.

Ms. Merritt shared that the nomination was submitted by the property owner’s Representative, and is aware of the nomination. The nomination was submitted under following Criteria: 1 - Association with a person, group, event, or series of events of historic importance. This includes national and local trends – Educational Development and School planning and design 2 – Architecture - As an example of an early 20th century institutional building with Colonial Revival details designed by a prominent local architecture firm Staff also found the property to be eligible under Criterion 3, as an example of work by

the firm Smith and May. Smith and May were the County Board of Education's most prolific architectural firm responsible for numerous Baltimore County schools in the second quarter of the twentieth century.

Mr. Dean noted that Smith and May also designed the original Colgate Elementary School in Dundalk. Mr. Holupka asked if other contemporary schools, designed by Smith and May throughout the County could be Landmarked under the same criteria. Mr. Holupka posited that designating every school that potentially meets the criteria could hinder needed development and place added expenses on the County. Ms. Merritt replied that there is potential to Landmark similar schools, but that this nomination came from the property owners, and that the structure no longer serves as a school.

Ms. Evans Letocha added that while the building's use has changed, the footprint has not been significantly altered. Mr. Liebel agreed that the structure has largely maintained its historic integrity, and is a well-preserved example of a Colonial Revival style school in early 20<sup>th</sup> century Baltimore County.

Mr. Dean moved to approve the nomination to the Preliminary Landmarks List, under Criteria 1, 2, and 3. Ms. Evans Letocha seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Dean, Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Liebel, Ms. McIver, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman. Mr. Holupka abstained from voting. There were no dissenting votes.

*Citing County Code 32-7-302, and National Register Bulletin "How to Apply the National Register Criteria for Evaluation."*

4. "Costa Property", 16223 Corbett Village Lane, Monkton. Contributing resource within the Corbett Village 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. Ms. Brannock shared the following summary of the code enforcement case: Historic Preservation Staff was contacted in November 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.

Ms. Brannock summarized the case with the following, the applicants came before the LPC at the March 14, May 9, and September 12, 2024 meetings seeking an ex-post facto review of the partially constructed 2-story, 26' by 48', accessory structure, with a height of 30'. with a 4-car garage, and gym/office space on the upper floors. Testimony was heard and submitted from several neighbors in the community at all meetings. It was a mix of support and opposition. The major concerns were the height, size, visibility and compatibility to the historic district. The LPC denied the request at the three previous meetings citing that the size and design of the structure did not meet our design guidelines.

A Technical Committee was also formed at the September meeting to conduct a site visit, which occurred on September 24, 2024. The technical committee submitted a report to the rest of the Commission and for the applicant's review. The Technical Committee recommended that the existing height of 30' and footprint be reduced to make the overall size/massing more in scale with the primary dwelling. In addition, they recommended keeping the design simple and adding fenestration on the most visible elevation.

The applicants returned with altered plans and a new design that addressed the concerns voiced at the September meeting, and the technical subcommittee's report.

The current proposal included the following:

- Reduced the existing 2-story, 26' x 48' structure with a height of 30', to 1 ½ stories, measuring 26' x 30', with a height of 19'7", and a saltbox-style roof

o Two-car garage on the first floor; the second floor will be used for storage with a max interior headroom of 6'5."

- An 18' x 26', shed-roof carport will be placed on the north elevation. The carport will be 11' high, and a covered rubberized membrane roof. It will be supported by three evenly spaced columns on the north. The carport will be open on the north and west elevations.
- The rear elevation will have no fenestration.
- The north elevation will have a single craftsman-style single-entry door that opens to the carport.
- The attic story will have a single window on each end.
- The south elevation, which is the most visible elevation, will have three evenly spaced bays on the first level, a single craftsman style door, and two windows.
- There will be two evenly spaced skylights on the rear roof slope.
- The roof will be covered with standing seam metal and the exterior walls will have vertical Hardie board siding.
- The west elevation will have a pair of double, carriage-style garage doors.

Ms. Brannock concluded her comments and asked the Commission to discuss the changes in height and size, as well as the overall design, and to determine if it complies with our guidelines.

Mr. Holman asked if there were any members of the public that signed up to speak.

Ms. Brannock introduced the first speaker, Mr. Andrew Clemens, a former resident of Corbett Village. Mr. Clemens provided written testimony and spoke at the March 14<sup>th</sup>, May 9<sup>th</sup> and September 12<sup>th</sup> meetings, and reiterated concerns about the height of the structure, and size of the footprint. Mr. Clemens noted that the design and materials changed many times, but that the overall height and size did not. Mr. Clemens added that the proposed carport on the north elevation maintains the original footprint of a four-vehicle garage. Mr. Clemens continued that there are no car-ports or flat roofs within Corbett Village, and that the structure is still highly visible from the NCR trail, and Corbett Village Lane.

Ms. Brannock introduced Ms. Kristiina Altman, a resident of Corbett Village. Ms. Altman submitted written testimony and spoke at the March 14<sup>th</sup>, May 9<sup>th</sup> and September 12<sup>th</sup> meetings. Ms. Altman noted that the LPC rejected the proposal each meeting for the proposal's failure to adequately reduce the overall size and height of the structure. She continued that the location of the structure at the top of a hill exacerbates its large size and dominates the skyline of the village. Ms. Altman added that she felt the architectural renderings are inaccurate and do not show the true size of the structure in relation to the primary dwelling.

Ms. Brannock introduced Mr. John MacFarlane, a resident of Corbett Village. Mr. MacFarlane submitted written testimony and spoke at the May 9<sup>th</sup> and September 12<sup>th</sup> meetings. Mr. MacFarlane stated that the proposed 19'7" height is too large, and that the final design should not be a compromise between a structure constructed without a permit, and a building that complies with the County's design standards for historic districts.

Ms. Brannock introduced Ms. Barbara MacFarlane, a resident of Corbett Village. Ms. MacFarlane provided testimony at the March 14<sup>th</sup>, May 9<sup>th</sup> and September 12<sup>th</sup> meetings. Ms. MacFarlane provided a summary of the Commission's decisions on the project over the last three meetings, and the technical committee's recommendations to further reduce the size and height of the structure. She continued that the footprint has remained the same, but is now divided between a two-vehicle garage, and a carport. Ms. MacFarlane shared her concern with the precedent that may be set if the Commission approved a structure that did not undergo the necessary, prior review and permit approval. Ms. MacFarlane suggested that the

second-story be removed, that the proposed salt-box style roof be replaced with a symmetrical gable roof, and that zoning variance concerns be addressed during the Commission's review.

Ms. Brannock introduced Mr. Jeremy Altman, a resident of Corbett Village. Mr. Altman provided testimony and spoke at the March 14<sup>th</sup>, and May 9<sup>th</sup> meetings. Mr. Altman stated that the current plans are identical in overall height and size to the previously denied plans. Mr. Altman continued that the carport and salt-box style roof are inappropriate for the historic district. He added that this roof style is typically found in Colonial New England architecture, and is out of place in a Victorian village in Baltimore County. Additionally, Mr. Altman shared that carports are found in 20<sup>th</sup> century communities, and are again, inappropriate additions to Victorian homes in Corbett Village.

Ms. Brannock introduced the property owners, Ms. Gina Costa, and Mr. Nate Costa. Mr. Costa shared that he was satisfied with Staff's summary and account of the measures taken to simplify the design and address concerns from previous meetings. Mr. Costa reiterated his desire for the structure to serve as both a garage, and gathering space for his family, as the footprint of their home does not accommodate their needs. Mr. Costa noted that the inclusion of a carport was suggested during the technical committee's site visit, in order to reduce the roof height. He continued that the flat, salt-box style roof would reduce the height of the roof pitch, and is in keeping with other existing flat roofs on the home.

Following technical difficulties, Ms. Brannock introduced the last registered speaker, Mr. Andrew Crosby. Mr. Crosby provided written testimony and spoke at the March 14<sup>th</sup> meeting. Mr. Crosby reiterated that he submitted written testimony to the Commission that outlined suggestions to make the structure comply with the County Historic Design Guidelines. Mr. Crosby expressed concern with the time that it will take for this project to undergo review by the LPC and Zoning, and asked that the Commission consider allowing the property owners to return with an updated design one additional time.

The Commission discussed the proposed salt-box style roof, overall size and height of the footprint, materials, and again determined that the structure was too large for the Historic District. Further, the Commission determined that a symmetrical gable-style roof be used, and that the carport be removed to reduce the enclosed footprint.

The Commission confirmed that the proposed material choices, and door and window styles were appropriate, and met the design guidelines.

Mr. Parts moved to deny the continued construction of the accessory structure, as proposed. Mr. Dean seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Dean, Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Liebel, Ms. McIver, Mr. Parts, and Mr. Weston. One dissenting vote was cast by Mr. Holman.

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

5. "Glyndon United Methodist Church", Trustees of Glyndon M E Church Property, 4713 Butler Road, Glyndon. Non-Contributing resource within the Glyndon County Historic District. Replacement of existing Flagstone walkways and steps with concrete [County Council District #4].

Ms. Brannock introduced the agenda item which involved the replacement of existing Flagstone walkways and steps. Ms. Brannock shared that the Glyndon United Methodist Church and Parsonage were constructed in 1931 in the Gothic revival style. The stone church has a sharply pitched slate gable roof, bell tower, and buttresses. Stone and stucco additions were constructed in 1958. Ms. Brannock noted that the church was constructed outside the period of significance for the Glyndon district (1868-1918) and is considered a non-contributing resource. However, the structure still possesses architectural merit

and will be reviewed with consideration of its age, architectural style, and overall impact to the historic district.

The applicant requested to replace the existing 1,742 sq ft flagstone front walkways and front steps with broom-finished concrete. The work will be within the existing footprint of the walkways. The front flagstone stairs meet an existing concrete sidewalk that runs along Butler Road. The application cites ongoing general maintenance issues and safety concerns for churchgoers who have tripped and fallen on the flagstone walkways. It was replaced previously in 2005 and requires yearly maintenance due to annual freeze and thawing of the ground.

Our design guidelines state “Non-contributing properties in a County Historic District should follow the same guidelines for landscaping, fences, additions, and new construction to help maintain the character of the area. However, flexibility is warranted when making material changes to non-contributing buildings. Decisions that make practical and aesthetic sense that may be contrary to specific guidelines are welcome when they uphold the overall intent of the Guidelines.”

Ms. Brannock asked that the Commission consider the following questions during their discussion:

- Is this the original walkway material or was it installed at a later time?
- Has there been investigation into why the flagstone has been deteriorating? Like improper grading or improper installation, etc. And then to address those underlying issues
- Was there any consideration in using a stamped concrete to help keep a similar aesthetic as the existing flagstone?
- Will the existing handrails on the steps be retained and reinstalled?
- Are there any ADA issues with the flagstone, which is why the concrete is being proposed?
- How will the change in material impact the overall aesthetics of the church’s setting?

Mr. Dean initiated discussion and asked if the existing stone had been previously, professionally replaced. A representative of the church nor the applicant was present at the meeting. Ms. Merritt confirmed that the application noted that the stone was repaired many times.

Mr. Parts added that stamped concrete tends to look artificial against stone and suggested that a stone edge be used.

Mr. Weston raised concern with the brightness of a poured concrete against the dark tan, natural stone. Mr. Weston suggested that the plaza be repaired with stone, and that the walkways use concrete.

Discussion continued on possible alternative materials.

Mr. Parts moved to approve the replacement of the flagstone walkways and steps with the following conditions: Use stone or salvaged flagstone as an edge or border along the broom finished concrete, to help soften the path’s edges; Use an exposed concrete aggregate material instead of the broom finished concrete, which will provide some texture to help soften the contrast between the church and walkways; and that updated plans with the new material be submitted to Staff to be reviewed by a technical committee of the LPC before work begins. Ms. Evans Letocha seconded the motion. Affirmative votes were cast by Mr. Dean, Ms. Evans Letocha, Ms. Ferguson, Mr. Holupka, Mr. Liebel, Ms. McIver, Mr. Parts, Mr. Weston, and Mr. Holman.

The subcommittee will consist of Ms. Evans Letocha, Mr. Liebel, and Mr. Parts.

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

## **Other Business**

No meeting in December.

Next meeting January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2025.

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

The meeting adjourned at 7:48 PM.

JCB:jcb