Agenda

Thursday, September 3, 2020; 7:00 p.m.

A public meeting of the Howard County Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) will be conducted on Thursday, September 3, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. Due to the State of Emergency and to adhere to social distancing measures, this meeting will not take place at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, but will be conducted as a virtual web meeting/conference call where the public is invited to speak on the following agenda items. All cases are public meetings where any member of the public may offer testimony. Certain cases, such as requests for Certificates of Approval, are contested cases subject to the County Administrative Procedure Act. Instructions on how to join the meeting are provided on the HPC webpage: www.howardcountymd.gov/Departments/Planning-and-Zoning/Boards-and-Commissions/Historic-Preservation-Commission. Additional information may be obtained from the Department of Planning and Zoning by emailing preservation@howardcountymd.gov. Part of the meeting may be closed to the public in accordance with Open Meetings Act procedures. Requests for accommodations should be made at least three working days in advance of the meeting.

This Agenda identifies the work proposed and includes comments and recommendations from DPZ Staff. The recommendations included here do not constitute a decision of the Commission.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

Regular Agenda
1. HPC-20-63 – 4889 Montgomery Road, Ellicott City, HO-538
2. HPC-20-64 – 8156 Main Street, Ellicott City
3. HPC-20-65 – 3715 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City
4. HPC-20-66 – 8385 Main Street, Ellicott City
5. HPC-20-67 – 3749 Church Road, Ellicott City, HO-58
6. HPC-20-68 – 3749 Church Road, Ellicott City, HO-58

OTHER BUSINESS
1. Rules of Procedure Update – consider proposals to update Rules to specifically address virtual hearings.
REGULAR AGENDA

HPC-20-63 – 4889 Montgomery Road, Ellicott City, HO-538
Applicant: James Joo

Request: The Applicant, James Joo, requests Advisory Comments for a subdivision plan at 4889 Montgomery Road

Background and Site Description: This property is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-538, the Marks-Lough House. According to SDAT, the building on the property dates to 1911.

The property consists of 2.02 acres and is zoned R-20.

Scope of Work: The Applicant proposes to create three total buildable lots (two new lots and one lot for the historic house). The historic house will remain on Lot 5. The Applicant proposes to remove a specimen tree from new Lot 6, which due to the size and age of the tree and proximity to the historic house, could be a historic tree.

The application form states that two structures are proposed for demolition, both are outbuildings; a garage and other outbuilding/possible cottage.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Section 16.118 – Protection of Historic Resources

1) Section 16.118, the Protection of Historic Resources state:
   a. “Historic buildings, structures and landscape features which are integral to the historic setting should be located on a single lot of suitable size to ensure protection of the historic structure and setting.”
   b. “Whenever possible, historic resources should be integrated into the design of the subdivision or site plan. If compatible, new and historic structures may be juxtaposed. Alternately, open space may be used to buffer the historic resources from new development.”
   c. “Access to the historic property should be via its existing driveway, wherever possible.”
   d. “The new subdivision road should be sited so that the lot layout does not intrude on the historic resources. The road should be oriented so that views of the historic property from the public road are of its primary facade.”
The house has been significantly altered from its original, historic state after it was sold in 2015. Major character defining features, such as the wrap around porch, columns, cornice, chimneys and floor to ceiling windows have been removed. The windows have all been altered and changed from 1:1 windows that were proportionate to the floor they were located on, to 6:6 simulated divided light windows that appear to be wider and shorter than the original windows and now of a standard modern size. The first floor windows are no longer floor to ceiling and have been altered with conjunctural features, such as a pedimented lintel, with a keystone, which did not historically exist. The bracketed cornice on the dormer windows also appears to have been removed. The Inventory form states the house originally had German lap siding, which appears to have been replaced with a modern siding of a different profile and exposure. According to the Inventory form, the original front door was an open bible and cross-paneled door, was flanked by leaden paned sidelights and a seventeen light, leaden paneled fanlight. This door has been removed and the opening has been made wider and a portico added over it, with a new door on the second floor. Each exterior façade has been significantly altered. For example, the south façade has had many window and door openings closed in, and in no way resembles the original design.

According to aerial photography from 2013, the property previously had many specimen and other large trees located in close proximity to the historic house and historic circular drive, which have all been removed. The Applicant proposes to remove the remaining specimen tree, which is a Black Oak with a diameter at breast height (dbh) of 38 inches. The Applicant states the tree is approximately 93 years old and is noted to be in good condition. The tree has a critical root zone of 57 feet. Staff research yielded a growth rate factor of 4 and would place this tree between 100 and 150 years because this oak is one of the smaller oak trees and would be older than another oak at this 38 “dbh size.

Due to the significant alterations that have been made to the house, it no longer retains its historic character or integrity; therefore, the new subdivision is unlikely to have an impact on the historic structure more than the alterations already have.
**Staff Recommendation to the HPC:** Staff recommends the HPC provide advice on the design of the new subdivision, to include the demolition of two outbuildings, removal of the specimen tree, and the impact of site development and subdivision plan on the historic home.

**HPC-20-64 – 8156 Main Street, Ellicott City**
Applicant: Donald R. Reuwer, Jr.

**Request:** The Applicant, Donald R. Reuwer, Jr., requests a Certificate of Approval to remove a tree at 8156 Main Street, Ellicott City.

**Background and Site Description:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to the SDAT, the building on the property dates to 1890. The application was initially posted as a Minor Alteration (MA-20-38) on the Commission’s website, but was removed due to an objection.

**Scope of Work:** The Applicant proposes to remove a tree located on the rocks at 8156 Main Street. The Applicant has identified the tree as being an invasive paper mulberry that self-planted. The tree to be removed is located in the area where the Applicant is looking into constructing terraces. The Applicant would like to remove the tree since it is an invasive species, living in an inadequate base of soil and causing the rocks out of which it is growing to crack. Staff conducted a site visit and confirmed that it is not a red mulberry (which is native) and that it meets several descriptors of a paper mulberry; the bark and heart leaves that are sandy on top and fuzzy on bottom all match paper mulberry, although the leaves do not appear lobed. Staff and the Applicant are unable to determine what other kind of tree it could be, if not a paper mulberry. The tree has three leaders; the largest of the three has a circumference of approximately 38.5 inches, which results in a diameter of 12.26 inches.
HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 9.B: Landscape and Site Elements; Trees and Other Vegetation

1) Chapter 9.B recommends, “Include landscaping improvements as part of any construction project in locations visible from a public way. In most cases, use plant varieties native to the area.”

2) Chapter 9.B recommends against the, “removal of live, mature trees, unless it is necessary due to disease, or to prevent damage to historic structures.”

The Commission has been consistent about recommending the planting of natives and the removal of invasive trees; however, the Guidelines are silent on removal of invasive species. The tree in question appears to be a paper mulberry, which is a non-native, invasive tree. MDInvasives.org states that paper mulberry trees should be kept out of cultivation.

The Guidelines recommend against the removal of live, mature trees, unless it is necessary due to disease or to prevent damage to historic structures. This tree appears to be healthy, and is mature, providing a dense canopy over the area; however, it is growing directly into the rock and could be limited in its root stability or long-term health. While staff were able to confirm that this was not a red mulberry, an arborist would be the best qualified to determine exactly what type of tree this is and evaluate its long-term root stability and health in order for the Commission to make an informed decision.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: If the tree is determined to be a paper mulberry, staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted.

HPC-20-65 – 3715 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City
Applicant: Michael Koplow

Request: The Applicant, Michael Koplow, requests a Certificate of Approval and Tax Credit Pre-Approval to make exterior alterations at 3715 Old Columbia Pike.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According the SDAT the building on the property dates to 1900, although it appears to have been modified over time. The Applicant has provided a history of the building, which includes being built as a car showroom with residential above. Previous uses include a florist, coffee shop and computer repair store.

On August 8, 2020 a tree fell on the building, significantly damaging the roof and siding. The Applicant was pre-approved for tax credits in MA-20-39 to replace the roof, gutter and soffits in-kind, as a result of the damage incurred.

Last month, the Applicant was approved to construct an addition, with HardiePlank panels/fiber cement panels, in case HPC-20-60.

Scope of Work: The Applicant now seeks approval to replace the asbestos siding on the entire building. The asbestos shingle siding was damaged when the tree fell, and rather than spot replace the damaged area, the Applicant would like to replace all of the siding. The Applicant looked under the existing asbestos to see if any historic siding materials existed, but it is only 1x8 wood framing. Historic photos of the building have not been found, which would have been helpful to determine what the siding material may have been.
The Applicant proposes to replace the existing asbestos siding with HardiePlank lap siding, German lap wood siding, or material of a similar nature. The siding would be painted yellow, to match the existing color.

Figure 8 - Damage to rear of building

Figure 9 – Tree that fell

Figure 10 - Damage to asbestos shingles

Figure 11 - Damage to building
HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 6.D: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Building; Wood Siding, Shingles and Logs

1) Chapter 6.D explains, “Many frame buildings have been covered with modern siding materials such as vinyl, aluminum, asphalt or asbestos. These treatments obscure the historic materials and details such as cornerboards and cornices, and can cause damage to the structure by sealing in moisture. New siding materials are becoming available that can be closer in appearance to wood siding than vinyl or aluminum. These materials, usually composites of wood fibers and binding ingredients, are varied in their appearance and maintenance qualities.”

2) Chapter 6.D recommends, “Remove asbestos shingles, aluminum siding or other coverings from historic buildings and repair or restore the original wall material.”

The building is currently sided in asbestos shingles and the original siding material was removed prior to the installation of the asbestos. It is unknown what the original siding material was. The Applicant propose to replace the shingles with a more historically appropriate option, but due to the emergency nature of the work, has not yet acquired cost estimates for the various siding options proposed.

Chapter 6.D: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Building; Wood Siding, Shingles and Logs

3) Chapter 6.D states the following is a possible exception: “If wood siding must be replaced on a historic building, a composite siding material may be considered, if wood is not a viable option, the composite siding conveys the appearance of the historic material, and application of the substitute material does not damage or obscure historic features. The texture, width, shape, profile and finish of the substitute siding material should be similar to the wood siding it replaces.”

In this case the existing siding is asbestos and not wood siding. As the tree unexpectedly fell on the building, the Applicant has not had an opportunity to get quotes and does not know if wood German lap siding is a viable option. It is also unknown if German lap siding was the original material, although it is known that asbestos was not the original material. It seems that a composite siding material would be appropriate, and would be an improvement over the existing asbestos shingles.

HardiePlank siding only comes in one profile, but has been used on several buildings in the District in the past, including a non-historic building constructed in a historic style fronting Main Street, a historic house on Maryland Avenue, new construction, and a historic building at St. Paul’s Church. HardiePlank siding looks most like painted wood siding when the smooth finish is used. German lap siding in the traditional wood profile is used in the District, but is only found in some composite siding materials that tend to be more expensive than wood siding, such as Boral TruExterior Siding. The exposure of the siding (Hardie or wood) should be similar to the exposures found on nearby historic buildings.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve:

1) The use of smooth lap HardiePlank, with the exposure to be similar to that found on nearby historic buildings.
2) A wood German lap siding, with the exposure to be similar to that found on nearby historic buildings.
3) Staff recommends the HPC approve tax credits for the wood siding. If HardiePlank is approved, Staff recommends the HPC determine if the material qualifies for tax credits as a replacement for the asbestos.
HPC-20-66 – 8385 Main Street, Ellicott City
Applicant: Jane Johnson

Request: The Applicant, requests a Certificate of Approval, for exterior alterations at 8385 Main Street, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT, the building on the property dates to 1920.

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic and Executive Order 2020-10, the County has established an expedited permitting process that allows temporary outdoor seating for food and beverage service uses. The applicant currently has a permit for outdoor seating; however, the permit is temporary and will expire in accordance with the Executive Order. Any businesses wishing to establish outdoor seating on a permanent basis are required to seek approval from the Commission if located in a historic district.

Scope of Work: The Applicant is seeking permission for permanent outdoor seating in two locations – on the side patio and on the sidewalk. Since the Applicant does not yet have permission to place tables and chairs on the County sidewalk, the HPC is only being asked to approve the seating on the side patio and the style of furniture. The Applicant has requested three black metal tables of the same style be added to the side of the new extended patio with the rebuilt wall. The tables are two feet in diameter and will accommodate two chairs at each table, to provide seating for six people.

If the Applicant receives permission from the County to place tables and chairs on the sidewalk, the Applicant will need to return to the HPC at that time.

Figure 12 - Proposed style of tables and chairs. From left to right, images A, B, C.

A brick wall on the right side of the building will be rebuilt in a new location, approximately two feet out from its current location, away from the building. The application states that the wall is crumbling from the 2016 and 2018 floods, and that water floods the sidewalks and enters the building during heavy rainfalls. The wall will be pushed back two feet, which will result in larger space under the side awning. The existing awning is not being replaced at this time and it is unclear if that runoff will now enter the proposed patio area. The sidewalk directly abuts the existing wall and will need to be dug out/excavated in order to build the wall in the new location. The application states that the new wall will look exactly like the existing wall. The existing wall is tiered in height in sections; the rear starts at 42-inches high, the next section is 33-inches high, then 27-inches high and ends at 20-inches high. Three tables seating two people each are proposed to be added to this widened section.
The existing space between the building and the wall is concrete. Once the area is widened, concrete will be re-poured for the larger space. The sidewalk leading to the rear of the building will be narrower once the wall is moved and will be about 36 inches wide at the widest area, and 24 inches at the narrowest part.

The wall will be reconstructed with concrete block and will be faced with a brick veneer. The veneer is called “historic brick.” The applicant did not state why a veneer was being proposed in lieu of real brick. The HPC has approved stone veneers in the past, typically for larger structural walls.

![Figure 14 - Damage to existing wall.](image)

Figure 14 - Damage to existing wall.

![Figure 13 - Proposed veneer example on taller wall.](image)

Figure 13 - Proposed veneer example on taller wall.

![Figure 15 - Comparison of proposed veneer against existing brick.](image)

Figure 15 - Comparison of proposed veneer against existing brick.

![Figure 16 - Wall to be moved and rebuilt but same height.](image)

Figure 16 - Wall to be moved and rebuilt but same height.

**HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:**
Chapter 10.C: Parking Lots, Public Streets and Street Furniture; Street Furniture

1) Chapter 10.C recommends:
   a. “Improve consistency in design throughout the historic district for items such as street lights, traffic signals, public signage, trash receptacles and other street furniture.”
   b. “Select street furniture that reinforces Ellicott City’s identity as a historic district.”
   c. “Carefully evaluate the need before placing additional street furniture on narrow historic district streets and sidewalks.”
   d. “Particularly along the commercial section of Main Street, place street furniture in areas where the sidewalk is wider or where adjacent public open space (such as the plaza next to the railroad museum) provides a more spacious environment.

The Applicant shows three possible options for street furniture, all of which are black metal. Images A and B seem the most appropriate to reinforce Ellicott City’s identity as a historic district, while Image C is a bit more industrial/modern (although it could be appropriate too as it is simple in design).

The location in front of the building, where the Applicant proposes to place the permanent outdoor seating, does have a wider sidewalk than other areas in the District and appears to be able to accommodate the tables and chairs for the temporary outdoor seating but cannot be considered at this time without the owner’s approval. The side patio is owned by the Applicant and can be considered for permanent outdoor seating.

Chapter 9.D: Landscape and Site Elements; Walls, Fences, Terraces, Walkways and Driveways

2) Chapter 9.D recommends, “construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures, particularly for features visible from a public way.”

The application states the wall will match the existing, so as long as the design and dimension of the wall, and the shape and color of the brick exactly match the existing, shifting the wall two feet will not affect the integrity of the building. The alteration is a minimal change and complies with the Guideline recommendations to use materials matching the existing.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the style of furniture and side patio location. Staff recommends the HPC approve the new wall construction, but determine if the veneer will match the building or if a real brick paver should be used.

HPC-20-67 – 3749 Church Road, Ellicott City, HO-58

Applicant: Gregory D. Mason

Request: The Applicant, Gregory D. Mason, requests Advisory Comments/Pre-Application Advice for site alterations that resulted in Zoning Violation, at 3749 Church Road, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT, the building on the property dates to 1830. The property is also listed on the Howard County Historic Sites Inventory as HO-58, Angelo Castle.

This property currently has a Zoning Violation, case number CE-20-012, for:
   1) 16.106.(a) & 16.123.(a)&(c) - Grading/clearing over 5,000 square feet without an approved plan that addresses storm-water management and erosion & sediment control.
2) 16.603 - Exterior alterations without Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), including but not limited to: tree removal; installing gravel & timber framed walkways; installing the timber retaining wall; and placing fill dirt & cinderblocks around the site.

Scope of Work: The Applicant requests Advisory Comments/Pre-Application Advice from the Commission, in order to explain the work that was done without a Certificate of Approval and propose ideas to remediate the site. The application lists the modifications made to the property witnessed during Zoning’s inspection and proposed changes that have not yet been completed. As a reminder, the proposed changes cannot occur until the Applicant has submitted an application for Certificate of Approval and received approval from the Commission. The modifications that have already been made to the property include the following, as quoted from the application:

1) Removal of 12 trees with a diameter of 12 inches or greater. The remaining tree trunks have been laid horizontally across the eastern side of the hill, adjacent to the railroad, to act as a temporary erosion control and slope stabilization, with the stumps acting as anchors. The application states that photographs of the 12 trees are available upon request.

2) Installation of three timber retaining walls along the slope, to the immediate north and east sides of the existing house. All three walls consist of timbers with wooden stakes and do not exceed 30 inches in height.

3) Placement of topsoil in the areas directly uphill of the three retaining walls. The walls are meant to provide temporary control for the topsoil until permanent plantings and slope stabilization can be applied.

4) Installation of gravel access path on the eastern edge of the existing house, to provide ease of access for maintenance to existing electrical and sanitary structures at this location. The paths have been lined with 4”x2” timbers, staked into the ground to act as containment for the gravel.

5) Gravel and timber linings have been applied (in the same manner as Item 2) to an existing gravel pathway along the south side of the house. The existing gravel was previously buried under a thin layer of topsoil that had accumulated due to erosion. Reapplication of gravel to this area is meant to provide additional access to the eastern side of the house as well as to prevent further erosion.

6) Placement of concrete cinder blocks along the southern side of the site as a temporary barrier against excess runoff flowing down toward Main Street.

The application outlines the following proposed modifications to the site. The following bulleted numbers are directly quoted from the application:

1) A combination of native perennials/biennials/annuals, shrubs and trees will be planted at various locations throughout the site to offset the trees removed prior to the Zoning property inspection, as well as to provide general ground stabilization at certain locations along the eastern slope of the property. Planting locations have been generally chosen to allow for adequate growth conditions (sun, moisture, etc.) for the various species of trees and shrubs that have been selected. A variety of trees and shrubs are proposed along the length of the eastern slope to control erosion and to intercept and mitigate excess soil and stormwater runoff from further uphill.

2) A mixture of perennials/biennials/annuals will be applied at several locations to provide general surface stabilization and to provide consistent growth from Spring through Fall.

3) Additional groundcover plantings are proposed for sloped areas further uphill on the site. The plantings are meant to provide slope stabilization at locations where stormwater erosion has been problematic in recent years, due to excess runoff entering the site off of Church Road.

4) Any additional areas of loose dirt/mud will be seeded with grass to provide stabilization.
5) The further removal of existing stumps and fallen trees. Stumps will be cut down to within 12 inches of top-of-grade and any excess branches and trunks will be removed at locations of proposed plantings.

6) Excess gravel and cinderblocks along the southern edge of the property will be removed and stockpiled on the western edge of the property. The areas where the gravel/cinderblocks were originally placed will be either seeded with grass or be planted with the wildflower mix.

There are three timber retaining walls shown on plan C1 on the north side of the house and identified in the completed scope of work. The two long walls are shown as being +/- 64 feet in length and +/- 28 inches in height. The other long wall is shown as +/- 62 feet in length with wood lattice and +/- 28 inches in height. The third wall, which appears to be the shortest in length, within this group of retaining walls does not contain measurements and is not clearly labeled on the plan; however is described in the scope. A fourth timber retaining wall is shown on the east side of the house, closer to the train tracks, that is +/- 85 feet in length and +/- 6 inches in height.

The trees that were removed consist of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TREE LABEL</th>
<th>DIAMETER (IN)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>16+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T12</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* STUMP DIAMETERS MEASURED AT 1-2FT FROM GROUND LEVEL.

Figure 17 - Conditions in January 2020

Figure 18 - Site conditions in January 2020. North of house looking east toward railroad tracks.
The proposed planting plan will consist of the plants listed in the following table. The site landscape plan is shown on page C2 of the application.

![Figure 19 - Site conditions in January 2020. Looking south east toward Main Street (buildings in background front Main Street, the B&O is visible, front Maryland Avenue) and train tracks.](image)

### PLANTING SCHEDULE - TREES / SHRUBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Common / Scientific)</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Spread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Elderberry</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9-12ft</td>
<td>9-12ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambucus canadensis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Holly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25-60ft</td>
<td>20-40ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilex opaca</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegheny Serviceberry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15-25ft</td>
<td>15-20ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelanchier leavis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Redbud</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15-30ft</td>
<td>25-35ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carola carolinensis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flowering Dogwood</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20-40ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornus florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Bayberry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5-8ft</td>
<td>5-8ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morilla pensylvanica</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pawpaw</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10-40ft</td>
<td>10-40ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asimina trifolia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redtwig Dogwood</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6-12ft</td>
<td>6-12ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornus sericea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silky Dogwood</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6-10ft</td>
<td>6-10ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornus amomum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweetbay Magnolia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12-20ft</td>
<td>10-20ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnolia virginiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witch Hazel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15-30ft</td>
<td>15-25ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamamelis virginiana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANTING SCHEDULE - PERENNIAL MIXTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Common / Scientific)</th>
<th>Plan Symbol</th>
<th>Cover Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blanketflower</td>
<td>California aster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbine</td>
<td>Aquilegia canadensis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornflower</td>
<td>Cichorium intybus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnny Jump Up</td>
<td>Viola pedunculata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNDIAL LUPINE</td>
<td>Lupinus perennis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purple CONIFLOWER</td>
<td>Echinacea purpurea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Yarrow</td>
<td>Achillea millefolium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Eyed Susan</td>
<td>Rudbeckia hirta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baby Blue Eyes</td>
<td>Nemophila maculata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Button</td>
<td>Centaurea cyanus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birds Eye</td>
<td>Gilia inclinata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmos</td>
<td>Cosmos bipinnatus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwarf Sunflower</td>
<td>Helianthus annuus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godetia</td>
<td>Clarica amena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican Hat</td>
<td>Rubia communis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Poppy</td>
<td>Passiflora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Mallow</td>
<td>Hibiscus moscheutos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spurred Snapdragon</td>
<td>Antennaria cordifolia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLANTING SCHEDULE - GROUND COVER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (Common / Scientific)</th>
<th>Cover Area</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Spread</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creeping Wintergreen</td>
<td>300sf</td>
<td>6-12in</td>
<td>24-36in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaulthera procumbens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwarf / Bunchberry Dogwood</td>
<td></td>
<td>3-6in</td>
<td>24-36in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornus canadensis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: PERENNIAL / BIENNIAL / ANNUAL MIXTURE IS APPLIED AT AN APPROXIMATE RATIO OF 60% / 10% / 30% RESPECTIVELY.
HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

**Chapter 9.A: Landscape and Site Elements; Topography and Water Courses**

1) Chapter 9.A explains, “Ellicott City’s natural setting is essential to its character. In projects that involve grading land, clearing vegetation or building new structures, care should be taken to protect and enhance natural features, views of important natural features, and the environmental setting of historic buildings. The Historic Preservation Commission will review the impact of such proposals on the historic setting of Ellicott City and particularly on the relationship of historic buildings to their sites.”

2) Chapter 9.A recommends, “Maintain and reinforce natural landscape elements, such as rock outcroppings, water courses and tree lines.”

**Chapter 9.B: Landscape and Site Elements; Trees and Other Vegetation**

3) Chapter 9.B recommends:
   a. “Retain mature trees and shrubs. Provide for their replacement when necessary.”
   b. “Include landscaping improvements as part of any construction project in locations visible from a public way. In most cases, use plant varieties native to the area.”
   c. “Retain landscaping patterns that reflect the historic development of the property. Use historic photographs or landscaping plans if these are available.”

4) Chapter 9.B recommends against:
   a. “The removal of live, mature trees, unless it is necessary due to disease or to prevent damage to historic structures.”
   b. “Extensive clearing for new construction that can be accommodated by more limited removal of vegetation.”

5) Chapter 9.B states the following requires approval: “Removing live trees with a diameter of 12 inches or greater 4.5 feet above ground level.”
Chapter 9.D: Landscape and Site Elements; Walls, Fences, Terraces, Walkways and Driveways

6) Chapter 9.D explains, “Retaining walls of granite, brick or timber may be appropriate, depending on the context. Concrete walls can be used in locations with very little visibility. New granite walls are expensive, but retaining walls faced with granite or with a surface treatment that resembles Ellicott City’s typical stonework can be appropriate in visible locations.

7) Chapter 9.D recommends:
   c. “Identify and retain site features that are important to the historic character of a site.”
   d. “Construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures, particularly for features visible from a public way.”

The above Guidelines are some of the most relevant sections from the Ellicott City Historic District Design Guidelines that are applicable to the alterations completed on site plan C-1 which reflects the alterations made without HPC approval.

Staff notes that the perennial and annual plant proposals are a seed mixture that are mostly sun loving plants. This plant list is not proposed to be in container pots. The southern area where the sycamore, oak and beech trees are very mature specimens that offer a lot of shade verse the necessary sun for these seeds. Plus with such large trees the earth is not soft soil where a seed would want to propagate and mature. Flowering dogwoods are an understory tree that require shade. Sun exposure on a slope may burn up the tree before it matures.

The Applicant should also work with DPZ’s Development Engineering Division and the Division of Land Development to determine if a site development plan is required for the disturbances made by the tree removal, construction of retaining walls and other alterations.

Additional photos from the Zoning inspection site visit in January 2020 can be found in Addendum A, at the end of the agenda.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC provide advice on solutions they would find acceptable to mitigate the removal of the trees and other alterations on site, so that the Applicant can return with an application for Certificate of Approval.

HPC-20-68 – 3749 Church Road, Ellicott City, HO-58
Applicant: Gregory D. Mason

Request: The Applicant, Gregory D. Mason, requests Tax Credit Pre-Approval for exterior repairs, at 3749 Church Road, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT, the building on the property dates to 1830. The property is also listed on the Howard County Historic Sites Inventory as HO-58, Angelo Castle.

As explained in case HPC-20-65, this property currently has a Zoning Violation, case number CE-20-012, for:
   1) 16.106.(a) & 16.123.(a)&(c) - Grading/clearing over 5,000 square feet without an approved plan that addresses storm-water management and erosion & sediment control.
2) 16.603 - Exterior alterations without Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), including but not limited to: tree removal; installing gravel & timber framed walkways; installing the timber retaining wall; and placing fill dirt & cinderblocks around the site.

Scope of Work: The Applicant proposes to the following repairs to the property:

1) Restore the cathedral window – This will include the repair and replacement of cracked panes of glass, rotted wood, repair of putty, and repainting the window frame to the existing color. Per the attached scope of work in the application, the window sashes will be disassembled, and all hardware removed. The window jamb will be prepared for interlocking metal weather strip components. The contactor will record relevant production notes regarding the sizing and jamb conditions. The window openings will be weatherized and secured (plastic or plywood) while the windows are being repaired in the shop.

The following work will take place at the shop:

a) Remove the old glass, after labeling, to be saved and re-installed as appropriate.
b) Remove any remaining hardware and put sashes in a stream stripper.
c) Remove all glazing and paint, including older leaded paint.
d) Rough sand (60 grit) flat surfaces and hand-sand profiles to remove all traces of old paint/primer.
e) Stabilize/repair the sashes using wooden dowels and structural epoxies.
f) Repair any broken parts (grills, stiles/rails, tenons using old-growth wood and/or 2-part, slow-cure epoxies.
g) Clean/wash and remove sashes from lead-room.
h) Power sand and hand sand till smooth (100 grit).
i) Prime with oil-based paint, let tack. Fill voids with wood filler, sand, and re-prime.
j) Re-install the glass with new glazing.
k) Apply finish paint – two topcoats; sanding in-between all coats for better paint bond and finish.
l) Restore old hardware and oil.
m) Prepare/modify sashes for bronze metal weather-stripping or RCT tube seals and install as appropriate.

The following work will take place at the residence:

o) Re-install restored sashes at hinge area and ensure proper fit.
p) Install metal weather-stripping at jamb area.
q) Re-install restored hardware.
r) Ensure smooth operation.
s) Touch-up paint.
t) Clean the glass.

2) Repair damaged stucco – Construct scaffolding, remove stucco from back/side walls. Repair sheathing and install vapor barrier. Install new stucco, color to match the existing off-white, and caulk all joints. Clean up, remove all debris and remove scaffolding.

Figure 21 - Cathedral window to be restored
HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

**Chapter 6.C: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Masonry**

1) Chapter 6.C recommends, “maintain or restore original brick, stone, concrete block or stucco. Make repairs with materials that match the original as closely as possible.”

2) Chapter 6.C recommends, “maintain previously painted masonry surfaces, including repainting when needed.”

3) Chapter 6.C considers the following to be Routine Maintenance, “Repairing stucco using a mixture that matches the existing stucco in texture, strength and appearance.”

The proposal to repair the damaged stucco in-kind complies with the Guideline recommendations. The work is eligible for tax credits, per Section 20.112 of the County Code.

**Chapter 6.H: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Windows**

4) Chapter 6.H recommends, “maintain and repair original window openings, frames, sashes, sills, lintels and trim. Maintain glass, putty and paint in good condition. Install weatherstripping to reduce air infiltration.

5) Chapter 6.H considers the following to be Routine Maintenance:
   a. “Repairing windows, including replacement of clear glass and putty.”
   b. “Installing weatherstripping.”

The proposal to repair the cathedral window in-kind complies with the Guideline recommendations. The work is eligible for tax credits per Section 20.112 of the County Code.

**Staff Recommendation to the HPC:** Staff recommends the HPC pre-approve 20.112 tax credits for window and stucco repair.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Rules of Procedure Update – consider proposals to update Rules to specifically address virtual hearings.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.
Addendum A – 3749 Church Road staff pictures

Figure 22 – Aerial of property for orientation. Photo dates to March/April 2019.
Figure 23 – North side of house, looking east toward railroad tracks/river.
Figure 24 – North side of house. Looking south at retaining walls, toward house.
Figure 25 – North side of house, looking east toward railroad tracks/river.
Figure 26 – North side of house, looking east toward railroad tracks/river.
Figure 27 and 28 – South side of house, looking east toward railroad tracks/river.
Figure 29 and 30 – South side of house, looking east toward railroad tracks/river.
Figure 31 – Southeast side of house looking north. Railroad/river directly to the east (right of picture).
Figure 32 – Southeast side of looking north. Railroad/river directly to the east (right of picture).
Figure 33 – Southeast side of looking north. Railroad/river directly to the east (right of picture).
Figure 34 – South side of property, looking west toward neighboring property.