



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
ELLCOTT CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
3430 Court House Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov
410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-1655
TDD 410-313-2323

2014 Historic Preservation Commission Meeting Minutes

January – no meeting

February

March

April

May

June

July

August

September

October

November

December



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ELlicott City Historic District ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov
410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-1655
TDD 410-313-2323

February Minutes

The first regular meeting for the year 2014 of the Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, February 6, 2014 in the C. Vernon Gray Room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, Maryland.

Members present: Joseph Hauser, Chair; Sam Crozier, Vice-Chair; Lisa Badart; Eileen Tennor; and Allan Shad

Members absent: None

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Dan Bennett, Lewis Taylor, and Carol Stirn

Chairman Joseph Hauser opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and the rules of the meeting. Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the December 5, 2013 minutes. Mr. Crozier seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. 14-01 –8024 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-70
2. 14-02 –14290 Triadelphia Road, Glenelg, HO-209
3. 14-03 – 3531 Sylvan Lane, Ellicott City
4. 14-04 – 8312 Main Street (Parking Lot E), Ellicott City
5. 14-05 – 8197 Main Street, Ellicott City (Taylor’s Antique Building)
6. 14-06 – 3709 Old Columbia Pike Ellicott City (Taylor’s Antique Building)
7. 14-07 – 3711 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City (Taylor’s Antique Building)

REGULAR AGENDA

14-01 – 8024 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-70

Replace windows. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Kelly McMillian

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT, the building dates to 1900. The Applicant proposes to replace the two second story front windows and seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work. The existing windows are vinyl 1:1. While the application states that the windows will be replaced with a 6:1 window, the Applicant has agreed to a 1:1 window, which better fits the historical architecture of the building. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Staff Comments: The replacement of vinyl windows with wood windows is an appropriate change. The application is consistent with Chapter 6.H recommendations, “replace inappropriate modern windows with windows of appropriate style. If documentary evidence of the original window is available, choose

new windows similar to the original. Otherwise, select windows appropriate to the period and style of the building.” The windows will be replaced with 1:1, which will match the other windows on the building that are not being replaced at this time, as well as the neighboring building it shares a storefront with. The existing interior and exterior wood trim will be repaired and re-used, it will not be replaced.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of a 1:1 wood window and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Kelly McMillian. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. McMillian did not have any comments. The Commission had no problems with the application.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the application and tax credit pre-approval. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-02 – 14290 Triadelphia Road, Glenelg HO-209

Exterior alterations, zoning conditional use.

Applicant: Homewood Properties, LLC

Background & Scope of Work: According to the Historic Sites Inventory form, the building dates to 1889. This case has come before the Commission as required by Section 131.N.27.d of the Zoning Regulations and Section 16.606(a) of the County Code. The Applicant is in the process of obtaining approval for a Zoning Conditional Use, but must first receive a determination of architectural compatibility for the exterior alterations on the historic structure prior to the approval of the Zoning Conditional Use.

The property, the Providence M.E.C.S church is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-209. Previously this structure was modified for a small business and personal residence. The property had been vacant for about 6 years. The Applicant has restored the original structure, demolished previous additions dating to the 1970s and constructed a new addition.

The new single story addition was constructed in place of the previous additions, to the side and rear of the historic structure. The addition is complimentary to the historic church and uses similar windows to tie the structures together. The addition is also covered in wood siding, to match the historic church. The roof pitch is the same as the historic church.

The original tin roof was in very poor condition, allowing water to infiltrate into the interior of the structure over the years, causing damage. The tin roof was replaced with a dark gray composite slate. The application states that the wood windows were severely damaged and replaced with gothic arch top aluminum clad wood windows that were custom made to match the original. The wood quatrefoil windows will be repaired and glass replaced as necessary.

The Dutch lap wood siding and trim was scraped and painted a fresh coat of white paint. The wood siding was replaced as needed with custom clear cut mahogany in the same profile and painted white.

The foundation on the historic church was repointed and repaired as needed. The foundation on the new addition was constructed with a natural stone veneer, to match the historic foundation.

The original 2 panel front entry doors were in very poor condition. The Applicant custom made a new set of mahogany 2-panels doors to match the original. There was also an existing side door, which has been replaced with a matching 2-panel door and expanded to 36 inches to accommodate ADA requirements. A handicapped accessible entry ramp will be constructed on the side of the building with the 36 inch door. The ramp will be flanked by natural stone pillars with low wrought iron fencing filling the gaps between the pillars.

There will be building mounted sconce lighting fixtures located at all existing and new entryways. For the parking lot and site lighting, there will be down lighting from the large trees. Some parts of the historic structures may be lighted as well.

A deck will be constructed on the rear of the new addition and made of a composite material designed to resemble Ipe wood. The deck will have a composite post railing painted black and stainless steel cables.

Staff Comments: This project did not utilize tax credits, as it just now coming before the Commission. However, any future repairs to the exterior of the historic church structure are eligible for the County's 25% historic tax credit program. The renovations to the historic structure comply with The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, Standard 2, "The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property shall be avoided." The replacement of several features complies with Standard 6, "Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture and where possible, materials."

The new addition complies with Standards 9, "New additions, exterior alterations or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

At this time Staff does not know if there was prior evidence of a slate roof existing on the church, in which case a metal roof should have been put back on, rather than the composite slate. However, Staff overall finds the renovations to be compatible with the historic structure.

Staff Recommendation: Staff finds the renovations are architecturally compatible with the historic structure.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Stacia Smith. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Smith had none. Mr. Crozier asked about the change of the paving from gravel to a paver. Ms. Smith stated is it not a paver; it is going to be asphalt. She explained that there was never any gravel; it was dirt with some rocks mixed in. Mr. Crozier commented the pavement closest to the tree was asphalt previously. Ms. Smith said there was asphalt, but it broke up over time so now there is nothing. She said the idea is to replace the asphalt. Mr. Crozier said that the oak tree may have a problem living with paving around it, and suggested some of the paving be moved away from the tree. Ms. Smith stated a tree expert had been brought in to tag and record all the trees and treat them. This was taken into consideration, as these trees had not been pruned or taken care of for about 15 to 20 years, but now have been pruned. The tree expert was not that concerned and had also reviewed the plans.

Mr. Crozier asked about the lighting to be used. Ms. Smith stated the lighting will be a very subtle

mixture since the property is historic. There will be some down lighting in a few of the trees, and once some planting is done there may be some lighting placed in the beds.

Ms. Badart asked what differentiates new construction from the original building on the new section facing the front door. Mr. Hauser swore in John Lehman, the architect on the project. Mr. Lehman stated the footprint is very similar to the 1970s addition. He explained the difference is that the construction is downscaled from the church. The mahogany siding on the original church and addition is identical. The roof pitch is also the same.

Mr. Crozier asked about the perk area and if a driveway can be put over it. Ms. Smith stated this would be up to the consultant Fisher, Collins and Carter.

Mr. Hauser feels the plan is a nice revival of the old structure. The Commission likes the project.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved that the Commission is in agreement with the Staff's finding of the renovations being architecturally compatible with the historic structure. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Taylor asked Staff about the conditional use determination and what the standard procedure will be since there is no control on when the conditional use is applied for; will the renovations have already occurred or there a way to pre-empt the process. Ms. Holmes stated Zoning can be contacted to find out.

14-03 – 3531 Sylvan Lane, Ellicott City

Rebuild house. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Joseph Marchese

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the house was built in 1930. This house is located at the end of Sylvan Lane, at the edge of the Historic District and recently caught on fire. The Applicant proposes to repair the house mostly in-kind, and make some minor changes.

The roof was a gray asphalt shingle roof and will be replaced in-kind to match. The windows were 1:1 white vinyl and will be replaced in-kind with vinyl to match. The front door was a 9-lite white steel door and will be replaced in-kind.

The siding is currently a combination of light green wood shake and vinyl lap siding. The Applicant proposes to replace the siding with a 7-inch HardiePlank horizontal siding, in a light green color. All soffits and fascia will also be replaced with a fiber cement product.

Staff Comments: The repairs are mostly in-kind. In 1990 the Commission approved the replacement of wood windows on the house with vinyl, finding that the house was not architecturally significant. It appears the siding has changed over time, without approval. As shingles have deteriorated, vinyl siding has been installed in sections.

At this time, the Commission must determine if the house is considered architecturally significant to the Ellicott City Historic District. Even though in 1990 the Commission determined it was not, structures can become significant as they age. This house is not eligible for tax credits if it is not considered architecturally significant to the district. At this point, Staff would not recommend tax credit pre-approval for the replacement windows as they are vinyl. Staff would not recommend tax credit pre-

approval for the replacement of siding and trim. While this structure is not an outstanding example of Ellicott City architecture, it is an example of a 1930s bungalow. The house neighbors two structures that date to the 1920s and another from 1956.

The in-kind replacement of the windows, roof and door comply with Chapter 5, which explains that Routine Maintenance is considered, “repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding, external doors and windows, trim, lights and other appurtenant fixtures using the same materials and design.” The replacement of the wood shingles and trim with HardiePlank siding and trim complies with Chapter 6.D recommendations, “composite siding materials may be used to replace wood siding on non-historic building if the particular material proposed is compatible in appearance with the building itself and with wood siding used on nearby historic buildings.” While the house is located next to two houses that date to the 1920s, those houses appear to have been altered over the years as well and do not appear architecturally significant either.

Regardless Staff has no objection to proposed changes, as this house is located at the edge of the historic district and it not highly visible. The overall form and shape of the house that give it the bungalow feel will not be impacted.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted, but recommends against tax credit pre-approval for the work, unless the Commission finds the house is architecturally significant.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Joseph Marchese. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Marchese said he did not have any. He explained the house had a fire and the goal is to try and repair the house with the funds available, and to comply with the historic guidelines. Mr. Hauser pointed out that tax credits cannot be given unless the structure is deemed important to the historic district. Mr. Hauser does feel the bungalow house is important to the historic district.

Mr. Taylor clarified an item in the Code regarding tax credit pre-approval. He explained it applies to “an existing principal structure located within a local historic district in Howard County which is determined by the Commission to be of historic or architectural significance or to be architecturally compatible with the historic structures in the district.”

Mr. Hauser stated this house is part of the past history of structures in Ellicott City. Even though it does not represent structures along Main Street, it is still important to the area. This is one of the only bungalows in Ellicott City. Ms. Tennor agrees about the structure being important. Ms. Badart asked if the intent is to do any trim work in wood or keep it all as HardiePlank. Mr. Marchese stated it will all be HardiePlank. Mr. Hauser asked Staff if any parts of the application could be given tax credits if the structure is deemed historically significant. Ms. Holmes stated it would be a material issue; if any work was to be done with wood or changed to wood it would be eligible. Mr. Hauser asked the Commission’s opinion of whether the structure is historically significant. Mr. Crozier stated not in the pure form, but it does represent an era. The structure is not new so it does have historic importance. Mr. Shad agrees. If this structure is a vanishing form of construction, it should be saved. The house could be renovated back into its original state.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved that the Commission has determined the structure to be architecturally significant to the Ellicott City historic district. The application is being approved, but no tax credits are being approved. If the Applicant wishes to change any features to be compliant with the guidelines, Staff should be contacted prior to the work being done in order to make a determination and approve any tax credits. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Taylor clarified for the record that the Commission has delegated tax credit pre-approval to Staff for the work in the application if the materials are changed to be historically appropriate, subject to Staff approval prior to submitted work.

14-04 – 8312 Main Street (Parking Lot E), Ellicott City

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: Mark Richmond, Howard County DPW

Background & Scope of Work: The Applicant proposes to make improvements to Parking Lot E (behind Ellicott Mills Brewery) and construct a stairwell connecting Main Street through the parking lot to upper Court Avenue and the Courthouse.

Vehicles currently enter the parking lot through a small driveway on Main Street between buildings. The current exit out of the parking lot is up a ramp on to Court Avenue. The new plan proposes to shut down the vehicular entry from Main Street, turning it into a pedestrian area, and redirecting entry and exit traffic to Court Avenue. There is an existing stone wall at the current exit (the new entrance and exit) that will have approximately 13 linear feet of wall removed in order to allow two-way traffic and accommodate a proper turning radius for trucks.

The old entry to the parking lot from Main Street will be closed off and turned into a pedestrian area that will continue as a pedestrian crosswalk over Main Street. Pinehall Brick pavers in English Edge Heavy Duty Full Range will be used as the paving material in order to define the alley space. Removable bollards will be placed at the edge of the old entrance to the parking lot. The removable bollards will be placed at both ends of the old entryway (at Main Street and in the parking lot), in order to stop traffic, but can be removed if needed.

Bollards will continue to be used at the new entryway to the parking lot. The existing wood bollards and chains will be removed and a fluted black iron or aluminum bollard by Reliance Foundry will be installed. The existing slope on the ramp will be removed and a retaining wall installed. The wall will be faced with a natural stone veneer.

There will be a total of four islands in the parking lot, whereas currently there are none. These islands help create a more orderly and attractive parking lot. One of the islands will contain a tree box, another island will be half brick paved and half vegetated. This island will have a bicycle rack bollard, the Reliance Foundry Ductile Iron Bike Bollard. These bicycle rack bollards will also be used in the new courtyard space at the old entrance. A dumpster that is currently located at the back entrance of 8308 Main Street (the Brewery) will be relocated and screened to be adjacent to the back of 8316 Main Street which is at the end of the entry/exit ramp. This relocation of the dumpster will free up space within the parking lot for both physical spaces and aesthetic appeal. A second dumpster will be added to the new designated space offering space for recycling. Both bins will sit on a concrete pad and be screened by a fence. Currently there is no screening for any dumpsters. The area behind the Brewery that contains a metal ADA ramp and brewery equipment will be cleaned up and consolidated. A new concrete ramp will be constructed and the Brewery's condenser unit will remain in place but have better protection and screening.

A stairway will be constructed starting at the top of Court Avenue and ending in the parking lot. The concrete staircase will switch back to accommodate the slope. The walls along the walkway will be faced with Pinnacle Natural stone veneer and a black metal railing will be used along the lower, outside wall for safety. The lower wall will rise about 18 inches above the stairs, but will vary in places with a two

foot high railing. The overall height of the wall and railing will be 42 inches high. The stairway will end at a circular landing, which will be paved with concrete that has two 12-inch paver width circular stone bands. A curved bench will be placed in this space. The first choice for the bench is the Mesa Curved bench and the second choice is the Timberform Restoration Curved Bench. The Mesa Curved bench is a simple dark colored bench with no back. The Timberform Restoration Curved Bench is a light colored traditional style bench with black metal armrests. A third option is a Victor Stanley bench, which is a traditional bench and not curved. Lantern style lamp posts will be added around the benches and they will be 10 feet tall. There will be 10 step lights in the walls on the staircase staggered between the two walls. The step lights will be a small black metal light.

The Applicant also proposes to remove 10 white cedar pines located above a wall at the back of the parking lot. These pines will be removed in order to install a bioretention area for collecting stormwater. Another 12 trees will be removed from the hillside in order to build the staircase.

Staff Comments: The application is consistent with Chapter 9 recommendations for landscape and site elements. The reconfiguring of the parking lot will make the lot more efficient and attractive.

The new materials that are being introduced to the site include black metal railings, bollards and lamp posts; stone veneer and brick pavers. These materials comply with Chapter 9.D (page 70) recommendations, "construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures, particularly for features visible from a public way." The new courtyard and circular staircase landing comply with 10.A recommendations, "For plazas, driveways, parking lots, walkways and other paved areas, use stone or stone-like materials as alternatives to asphalt or concrete where practical." While the circular landing will be concrete, it is part of the concrete stairs and keeps the design consistent. The stone bands in the landing will incorporate the stone from the walls into the design.

Chapter 9.D of the Guidelines (page 70) recommends, "Identify and retain site features that are important the historic character of a site." The 13 feet of wall that needs to be removed at the Court Avenue entrance is necessary to provide a proper turning radius. Additionally, the wall will not be removed in its entirety and the portion that is being removed is in poor condition.

While the Guidelines (page 65) do recommend, "Retain mature trees and shrubs, provide for their replacement when necessary," the trees on the site, including the pine trees, did not historically exist as the area once contained a lumber mill. The pines are quite large at this point, but could easily be damaged in a storm. With a cluster of mature trees, the concern for the roots to compromise the existing wall adjacent to the trees is great causing further wall collapse. Ellicott City does not have many green areas to create bioretention and this location will capture stormwater runoff as it comes down the steep hill and benefit the community. The trees will not be completely replaced, however there will be landscaping around the new staircase. The new landscaping will be reviewed in the future, but will comply with Chapter 9.B (page 65) recommendations, "including 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."

The lamp posts comply with Chapter 9.E recommendations, which recommend against, "lighting fixtures out of scale with Ellicott City's pedestrian environment." The Guidelines state, "use freestanding lights that are...no more than 14 feet high for commercial or institutional properties." The Guidelines also recommend using "dark metal or a similar material." The lamp posts will be a black metal and are only 10 feet high. The lantern style light is found elsewhere in Ellicott City and complies with Chapter 10.D (page 78) recommendations, "whenever possible, use a consistent design of light poles and fixtures within a given area of the historic district." The step lights also comply with the Guidelines as they are

small, black metal lights in an unobtrusive location.

While the Mesa Curved bench is made of 100% recycled materials and not wood, the benches will be dark brown and will blend in unobtrusively with the landing area and stone wall. It is a very simple bench and is compatible with the other benches found in Ellicott City. Chapter 10.C of the Guidelines recommend, "Use street furniture that is simple in design and constructed of traditional materials such as wood and dark metal" and "improve consistency in design throughout the historic district for items such as street lights, traffic signals, public signage...and other street furniture." The Mesa bench would be the first of its design in Ellicott City, but it is also the first curved bench. For this reason, Staff has no objection to using it over the more traditional style of bench, as it is very simple in design and will not stand out.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Mark Richmond of Howard County DPW, Amy Hribar of McCormick Taylor, and Kyle Mundy of McCormick Taylor. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Richmond, Ms. Hribar and Ms. Mundy had none. Mr. Crozier asked to see on the plan where the existing trees to be removed are located. Ms. Hribar pointed out the location. Ms. Burgess stated the 12 white pines were intentionally planted, but the other plants on the slope are shrubs which have grown over time.

Ms. Badart asked if the bench is in the circle at the beginning of the stairs. Ms. Hribar stated yes. Mr. Crozier questioned if the stairs are handicapped accessible. Ms. Hribar said the stairs are not ADA accessible.

Mr. Hauser asked which retaining walls were being removed and replaced. Ms. Hribar stated there is a wall which failed and it will be re-stabilized and tied into the grade. The lower wall is being retained. Mr. Hauser said he was referring to the retaining wall by Court Avenue and asked what the condition of the wall is and whether there any concerns with the new construction. Ms. Hribar stated the wall's stability will need to be verified. Mr. Hauser pointed out that the bioretention area is being created at this point, which will take water off of Court Avenue to prevent it from going into Main Street. Mr. Richmond stated there is a break in the curb where water will run down. The present curb is not a full curb; a more pronounced curb will be constructed.

Mr. Hauser asked if there will be an increase or decrease in parking spaces. Mr. Richmond stated there will be a slight decrease. Mr. Hauser asked about the planning of non-native species. Ms. Holmes said that a formal landscape plan is going to be submitted later, but any planting suggestions could be made now. Mr. Hauser suggested that only native plants be used and to stay away from non-native. Ms. Mundy said a majority of the planting plan is done. Ms. Hribar added all species being used are native, except for one which needs to be coordinated. Ms. Holmes asked if the Commission was fine with the Mesa bench. There was no objection. Mr. Hauser asked if the lighting is electric or solar. Ms. Hribar stated electric.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the application as submitted. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-05 – 8197 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement program funds.

Applicant: Don Reuwer

Background & Scope of Work: According to the Historic Sites Inventory, the building dates to 1924, as a fire in 1915 burned the previous building. The Applicant proposes to make exterior repairs and alterations to the building commonly known as Taylor’s Antique Mall. This application is part of a larger redevelopment of several buildings along Main Street and Old Columbia Pike. Those applications will be presented after this one, each building presented individually. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement Program funding for the work.

The Applicant proposes the following work:

- 1) Remove white paint and modern sign from the side of the Taylor’s building. Clean the brick where paint is removed.
- 2) Clean brick on front, sides and rear of building as needed. Repoint mortar as needed.
- 3) Replace existing modern white membrane roof with a new white membrane roof.
- 4) Remove rotten wood from cornice, replace wood to match existing design and repaint cornice.
- 5) Scrape and paint wood trim on storefront and around windows. Replace any rotten wood and paint, repair and/or replace metal as need and paint Benjamin Moore Carrington Beige
- 6) Replace storefront doors/and frame as needed and paint Benjamin Moore Carrington Beige.
- 7) Paint existing accent areas on storefront Sundried Tomato red.
- 8) Remove window air conditioning units
- 9) Restore existing historic Taylor’s sign.
- 10) Clean granite below storefront window.
- 11) Repair the existing wood windows on the front of the building.
- 12) Repair the existing wood windows on the rear of the building, but replace as needed due to deterioration to match the existing.
- 13) Cover exposed concrete block on side of building with DryVit in a red color, Red Clay (pending a separate application that will be heard later tonight regarding the demolition of a neighboring building).

The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work, as well as Façade Improvement Program funds.

Staff Comments: The work generally complies with Chapter 6 recommendations for the Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings.

Removing Paint and Cleaning Granite

Removing the paint and non-historic sign from the side of the building and cleaning and repointing all of the brick as needed complies with Chapter 6.C (page 26) recommendations, “maintain or restore original brick, stone, concrete block or stucco. Make repairs with materials that match the original as closely as possible” and “carefully remove modern materials that have been applied over historic masonry.”

Replacing Roof

The replacement of the existing modern white membrane roof with a new white membrane roof is Routine Maintenance and requires approval for tax credits. However, replacing the roof is important to protect the structure, which will be undergoing a significant renovation. The replacement of the modern roof is consistent with Chapter 5 which states that Routine Maintenance includes, “repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding...and other appurtenant fixtures using the same materials and design.” The white membrane roof color is better for the reflective factor and for the cooling of the

water for the health of the River.

Replacing Windows

The repair of the existing wood windows is consistent with Chapter 6.H recommendations, “maintain and repair original window openings, frames, sashes, sills, lintels and trim. Maintain glass, putty and paint in good condition.” The windows on the rear of the building will be repaired and only replaced as needed. Staff has requested photos of the damaged windows that need to be replaced. The replacement of only the deteriorated windows complies with Chapter 6.G recommendations, “when repair is not possible, replace original windows, frames, and related details with features that fit the original openings and are of the same style, material, finish and window pane configuration. If possible, reproduce frame size and profile and muntin detailing.”

Repairing and Painting Cornice

The repair and painting of the rotten wood cornice complies with Chapter 6.J (page 44) recommendations, “maintain and repair original cornices and ornamentation or details added to the original building that have acquired historic significance” and “replace deteriorated features with materials as similar to the original as possible.”

Storefront Doors

The scraping and painting on the storefront, as well replacing rotten wood as needed complies with Chapter 6.K (page 47) recommendations, “repair historic metal, glass, stone or wood details. If elements are too deteriorated to repair, replace in kind or with compatible substitute materials.” The Guidelines (page 47) recommend against “removing or replacing historic storefront details that could be repaired.” Replacing the storefront doors and frames as needed is consistent with Chapter 6.G recommendations, which recommends against, “unnecessarily replacing original doors and entrance features on historic buildings.”

Window Air Conditioners

The Guidelines (page 49) recommend against installing window air conditioning units in the building’s primary façade. As such, the removal of the air conditioning unit would better comply with the Guidelines.

Taylor’s Historic Sign

The Applicant also proposes to restore the historic Taylor’s sign and bring it back to working condition. The sign will have daylight sensors added. The sign will be re-installed using new mounting, suspension cables, hardware and turn buckles.

DryVit Covering on Concrete Block Wall

The Guidelines offer no recommendations for covering the concrete block that would be exposed if a building is demolished. However, Staff has no objection to covering the building with the DryVit, which will present a finished face to the areas visible from the public way.

Paint Colors

The proposed color for the trim on the building is Benjamin Moore Carrington Beige with accents to be painted Benjamin Moore Sundried Tomato. The DryVit wall would be a similar color to the Sundried Tomato, a color called Red Clay. The colors comply with Chapter 6.N (page 50) of the Guidelines which recommend, “use colors appropriate to the period and style of the building” and “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring building. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The proposed new colors are very similar to the existing colors on the

building and do not clash with any neighboring buildings.

Tax Credits

Items 1-12 are eligible for tax credits as they meet the intent of Section 20.112 of the County Code, which states that eligible work includes, “The repair or replacement of exterior features of the structure; Work that is necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure with regard to safety, durability, or weatherproofing; Maintenance of the exterior of the structure, including routine maintenance as defined in Section 16.601 of the County Code.” Staff does not find that Item 13 is eligible for tax credits, as the wall only requires the DryVit if another building is demolished. Additionally, Staff finds the replacement windows would only be eligible for tax credit if there is evidence that they are beyond repair. However, repair of the windows would be eligible for tax credits.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Façade Improvement Program Recommendation: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds and a determination of whether the Applicant has maxed out their available portion of funds. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: Staff asked if the Commission has reviewed the report and if Staff could summarize the report instead of reading the entire report verbatim. The Commission agreed to hear a summary instead of the entire report. Mr. Taylor stated for the record the Staff report is incorporated in its entirety into the record by reference

Mr. Hauser swore in Megan Reuwer and Don Reuwer. Mr. Hauser recused himself and turned the case over to Ms. Badart. Ms. Badart asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Reuwer said that he would like to go ahead and proceed with the DryVit, even though the demolition request will be removed. Mr. Reuwer stated the DryVit adds insulation; it is like a stucco surface when finished. Ms. Tennor asked if the concrete block is at street level on which the DryVit is to be placed or is it not visible. Ms. Reuwer stated it is not in the public right-of-way, the location starts at the second floor and hangs over the river.

Mr. Taylor wanted to clarify that Staff does recommend tax credit pre-approval for Items 1-12, but not for Item 13. Even though the Staff report stated Item 13 is being requested pending a separate application, this is no longer the case. The Applicant would like approval of Item 13 regardless of the other case. The Applicant stated that is correct. Mr. Taylor stated the application is so amended.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve Items 1-13 as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for Items 1-12. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-06 – 3709 Old Columbia Pike Ellicott City

Exterior alterations and repairs. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement program funds.

Applicant: Don Reuwer

Background & Scope of Work: According to the Historic Sites Inventory form, the stone and frame building at 3709 Old Columbia Pike on the corner of Main Street and Old Columbia Pike (formerly known

as part of Taylor Antique Mall), dates to approximately 1835. The Applicant proposes to make the following repairs and alterations to the building:

1. Remove addition on the back of the building.
2. Restore granite block wall where rear addition was and replace rotten siding above it with HardiePlank lap siding.
3. Replace all wood siding on the front and rear of the building with HardiePlank beaded cedarmill siding in the color Monterey Taupe. If HardiePlank siding is not permitted, replace wood siding with wood painted Benjamin Moore Old Salem Gray, a tan color.
4. Extend HardiePlank siding to the east side of the building and install new wood frame windows if request to demolish concrete block building is approved (this demolition request will be the next case, HDC-14-07).
5. Remove paint from granite on the front of the building. Repoint mortar as needed.
6. Clean and repair granite as needed. Repoint mortar as needed.
7. Paint all trim Benjamin Moore Carrington Beige.
8. Paint doors Benjamin Moore Sundried Tomato.
9. Replace existing white membrane roof with a new white membrane roof.
10. Replace rotten wood on dormers and paint.
11. Replace 2nd floor front façade and rear windows with new wood windows, to match the existing.
12. Repair front façade storefront window.
13. Remove Lego sign on front façade and replace existing closed off door with a window.
14. Replace existing wood shingles on the mansard roof with synthetic slate roof to match the existing façade.
15. Remove deteriorated tar paper over storefront windows and replace with a copper roof.
16. Replace existing white membrane roof with a white membrane roof.
17. Replace tar paper over storefront windows with copper roof.
18. Scrape and paint wood trim around doorways and around storefront windows, replace modern door with wood paneled door.
19. In a future application, install a patio/deck behind 3709 Old Columbia Pike and 8197 Main Street (this will not be voted on tonight, but is mentioned to understand the project comprehensively).

Staff Comments: The application generally complies with Chapter 6 recommendations.

Rear Addition

The Applicant indicates that the rear addition is not historic. However, the County Architectural Historian says the addition most likely is historic and dates to the 19th century. The Applicant proposes to remove this addition and restore the granite wall and siding behind and above it. The plan for the space would include an outdoor patio or deck. However, the actual design of this space is not part of this application, but is mentioned in order to understand the total scope of work. The Guidelines and Rules of Procedure do seem to distinguish between the demolition of a historic addition versus the demolition of an entire building.

Wood Siding

The Applicant also proposes to replace all of the wood siding on the front and rear of the building and replace it with HardiePlank beaded cedarmill siding in the color Monterey Taupe. While some of the siding may need to be replaced, Staff recommends against removing all of the siding and replacing it with HardiePlank. The Guidelines (page 30) recommend against “covering or removing sound wood siding.” Chapter 6.D (page 30) of the Guidelines recommends, “when necessary, replace deteriorated wood siding or shingles with wood siding or shingles that match the original as closely as possible in width, shape, and profile. Maintain the original shape and width of details such as cornerboards, cornices and door and window trim.” While the Guidelines do state, “if wood siding must be replaced on

a historic building, a composite siding material may be considered..." there is not enough evidence to suggest that the existing wood siding is in need of replacement. Additionally, the Façade Improvement Program requires that any material replaced is done so with historic, traditional building materials.

Removing Paint and Cleaning Granite

The removal of the paint from the granite on the front of the building and repointing of the mortar is consistent with Chapter 6.C (page 26) recommendations, "maintain or restore original brick, stone, concrete block or stucco. Make repairs with materials that match the original as closely as possible" and "carefully remove modern materials that have been applied over historic masonry." The cleaning and repair of the granite and mortar on the entire building is also consistent with Chapter 6.C recommendations.

Replacing Roof

The replacement of the existing modern white membrane roof with a new white membrane roof is Routine Maintenance and requires approval for tax credits. However, replacing the roof is important to protect the structure, which will be undergoing a significant renovation. The replacement of the modern roof is consistent with Chapter 5 which states that Routine Maintenance includes, "repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding...and other appurtenant fixtures using the same materials and design."

Repairing and Replacing Dormers and Windows

The replacement of rotten wood on the dormers due to deterioration complies with Chapter 6.H recommendations, "when repair is not possible, replace original windows, frames and related details with features that fit the original openings and are of the same style, materials, finish and window pane configuration. If possible, reproduce frame size and profile and muntin detailing." The Applicant also proposes to replace all of the windows with new windows to match the existing. The dormers on the front of the building most likely are original. Staff recommends they be repaired if possible, rather than replaced. Staff has requested photos of the damaged windows. However, if the windows are beyond repair, the replacement complies with Chapter 6.H recommendations as referenced above. The storefront window will be repaired, not replaced, which complies with Chapter 6.H recommendations, "maintain and repair original window openings, frames, sashes, sills, lintels and trim. Maintain glass, putty and paint in good condition."

Lego Sign and Door

The Applicant proposes to remove the Lego sign and door front the front of the building. However that doorway is the original entrance into the building and should be retained. It does not need to be a functioning door, but should remain a door. Chapter 6.G of the Guidelines recommends against "unnecessarily replacing original doors and entrance features on historic buildings" and "changing the size of door openings." The size of the opening would need to be changed to accommodate a window. If light is desired in this space, an appropriate glass paneled door can be installed.

Wood Shingles on Mansard Roof

The replacement of the wood shingles on the mansard roof with synthetic slate is not an appropriate change. There is no evidence that slate ever existed on the roof and the wood shingles were installed in a very unusual decorative pattern. Chapter 6.E (page 31) explains that "historic roofing materials include wood shingles, metal and slate." The Guidelines further explain that "wood shingle roofs are now rare in the historic district. To retain the district' historic character, every effort should be made to repair and preserve historic wood, metal or slate roofing, particularly for roofs visible from public ways, and to replace historic roofing with similar material." There is a photo of this building dating to 1983 that shows the roof was once painted blue. The roof could be painted again, to be refreshed and fit in with the building color scheme.

Storefront Window Roof

The addition of the copper complies with Chapter 6.K recommendations, “when planning storefront repairs or alterations, unify the upper and lower floors in the new design. Use appropriate and matching materials and colors throughout the façade; use materials appropriate to the style and period of the building.” While it is unlikely that copper was ever used on this particular building, the copper will be more durable and attractive than the tar paper and will unify the two storefronts.

Doorway

Scraping and painting the wood trim around the doorways and around storefront windows is considered Routine Maintenance. Replacing the modern metal door with a wood paneled door complies with Chapter 6.G (page 37) recommendations, “replace inappropriate modern doors with doors of an appropriate style. If documentary evidence of the original door is available, choose a new door similar to the original. Otherwise, use a door appropriate to the period and style of the building.”

Paint Colors

The proposed color for the trim on the building is Benjamin Moore Carrington Beige with accents to be painted Benjamin Moore Sundried Tomato. The color for the HardiePlank siding would be Monterey Taupe and the color for the wood siding would be a similar color, Old Salem Gray. The colors comply with Chapter 6.N (page 50) of the Guidelines which recommend, “use colors appropriate to the period and style of the building” and “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring building. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The proposed new colors are very similar to the existing colors on the building and do not clash with any neighboring buildings.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of:

- 1) Approval of Item 1, the removal of the rear addition, if the Commission determines the change is appropriate and Approval of Item 2, restoring the wall.
- 2) Approval of Item 3, if all siding is replaced with wood and tax credit pre-approval for the work.
- 3) Approval of Item 4, if all siding is added in wood (pending the application for demolition).
- 4) Approval of Items 5-10 and tax credit pre-approval for the work.
- 5) Approval of Item 11 if repair of the windows is not possible and tax credit pre-approval for the work. Any new windows must completely replicate the windows that are replaced.
- 6) Approval of Items 12, 15-18 and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Staff recommends the following items be amended:

- 1) Item 13 should be amended to leave a door in place and not add a window.
- 2) Item 14 should be amended to leave or replace as needed wood shingles on the mansard roof as synthetic slate is not an appropriate change.

Façade Improvement Program Recommendation: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds and a determination of whether the Applicant has maxed out their available portion of funds. However, the Façade Improvement Programs requires the wood siding and wood shingle mansard roof remain. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser is also recused from Case 14-06. The Applicants are already sworn in from the

previous case. Ms. Badart asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Reuwer stated the building was originally a 2-story stone building, but at some point a third story was added along with a mansard roof. Mr. Reuwer would like to see the building back to a simple 2-story building out of the 1800s, but over time the mansard roof with the third story also becomes historic. Regarding removing the back, a lot of buildings are now being built over the river.

Mr. Taylor clarified there is an application 14-07 which is the building to be discussed later for advisory comments. He said there is a portion of the building subject to case 14-06 containing a partial demolition request. Mr. Taylor asked to clarify if Item #4 is being removed in its entirety or being changed to conditional to approve, so if the demolition eventually occurs the case does not have to return to the Commission. The Applicant would like to get approval for it now, in order to avoid returning in the future.

Ms. Badart confirmed that Mr. Reuwer wants to remove the one-story addition on the back of the mansard roof building. Mr. Reuwer wants to know if he has to remove the addition if he is given permission to remove it or if he can choose to keep it. The Commission agreed that he could decide, if they approved the removal.

Ms. Badart asked Ms. Reuwer if she is agreeable to all the replacement work to be done in-kind and all the recommendations of Staff to be done. Ms. Reuwer agreed. Ms. Reuwer said they will replace the mansard roof with wood shake to match the design, the siding with wood, and to replace the lego door with a door instead of a window. Mr. Taylor asked Ms. Reuwer if she is agreeable to the amended items stated by Staff, the roof, siding and door, and the Commission's determination on the partial demolition. Ms. Reuwer agrees. Ms. Badart asked the Commission if anyone objects to a partial demolition of the back building. The Commission had no objection. Ms. Badart if there was anyone in the audience who would like to make comments.

Ms. Holmes said that Ken Short is present and available to answer any questions regarding the historic structures. Ms. Badart swore in Ken Short. Ms. Tennor asked about the white block showing on one of the buildings and asked about the material. Mr. Short stated the material is granite rubble.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve the application per the Staff recommendations for all items except Items 2 and 3. The stipulation for Items 2 and 3 is if the siding needs to be replaced wood is to be used. Mr. Crozier seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-07 – 3711 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City

Demolition.

Applicant: Don Reuwer

Background & Scope of Work: According to the Historic Sites Inventory form, the building dates to the 1920s. The Applicant proposes to demolish the three story concrete block building. The Applicant has provided a structural engineer's report, by Skarda and Associates, Inc., which outlines issues with the building.

The application explains:

“the steel beam supports that underlie the building and hold it above the Tiber River are significantly rusted. The roof, floors, and walls are all in disrepair and require re-structuring. The exterior walls are beginning to pull away from the entire third story of the building. For these reasons, it would be cost prohibitive and an undue financial hardship to the owner to shore up, reinforce, and rebuild the deteriorated sections of

this building.”

The Applicant proposes to demolish the building and daylight the river, which the building was built directly on top of. A rendering shows the sidewalk will be expanded where the building previously sat. A railing will allow people walking around to view the river from the sidewalk.

The structural engineers report provides the following information:

- 1) At the three story structure, there is a noticeable separation between the third floor walls and the third floor framing. There are diagonal stress cracks in the plastic as well. This indicates that the exterior walls are pulling away from the third floor and the walls are either settling or their first floor supporting beams are excessively deflecting or failing.
- 2) The rear second and third floor wall at the low roof transition has dropped approximately 3 inches. It appears this wall does not continue to the ground and is supported by a transfer beam within the second floor framing. It is this beam that is failing which is causing the excessive deflection.
- 3) The first floor framing over the stream and much of the structures above are supported by steel beams that span across the stream. Some of the steel beams are significantly rusted.

The structural report found issues with the other two buildings as well. The structural report also states, “If you decide or intend on keeping these buildings, please be advised that temporary needling and shoring the building at 3711 is increasingly problematic over the stream, and along the adjacent property line and the building at 3713. This building could collapse over those areas at any time.”

The Applicant also proposes to remove a tree that is growing up from the river, between the Taylor’s main building, the stone building and a neighboring property.

Staff Comments:

Demolition

Section 301 of the Rules of Procedure indicates that documentary evidence must be submitted to support the demolition request. The Rules of Procedure also indicate that before the Commission acts on an application for demolition, they shall determine whether the building is a Structure of Unusual Importance, which is defined by Section 302 (page 14-15) of the Rules of Procedure as:

- 1) Structures deemed by the Commission to be of unusual importance to the Nation, State or County, whose loss would cause great damage to the character and integrity of the historic district.
- 2) Determination that a structure is a Structure of Unusual Importance shall be based on criteria in its adopted guidelines, the testimony of expert witnesses or other documentary evidence presented to the Commission.

If the Commission determines the structure is a Structure of Unusual Importance, they may deny the Application unless:

- 1) The structure is a deterrent to a major improvement program which will be of substantial benefit to the County; or
- 2) Retention of the structure would cause undue financial hardship to the owner; or
- 3) Retention of the structure would not be in the interest of a majority of the persons in the community.

Section 304 of the Rules of Procedure outlines the process for ‘Demolition of Other Structures’. Section 304 states that if the Commission determines the structure is not a Structure of Unusual Importance, they shall vote to approve or deny the application based on the standards in Section 16.607 of the

Howard County Code and its adopted Guidelines. The standards for review in Section 16.607 are:

- 1) The historic, architectural, or archeological value or significance of the structure and its relationship to historic value of the surrounding area.
- 2) The relationship of the exterior architectural features of such structure to the remainder of the structure and to the surrounding area.
- 3) The general compatibility of exterior design, scale, proportion, arrangement, texture and material proposed to be used.
- 4) Any other factors, including aesthetic factors, which the Commission deems to be pertinent.

Additionally the Rules of Procedure, Section 304, state: "Before taking action on an application, the Commission may ask whether the Applicant is willing to have the Commission assist the Applicant in trying to develop an economically feasible plan to retain the structure. If the Applicant is willing to work with the Commission to try to develop such a plan, the Commission may continue the meeting to allow the Applicant and the Commission time to pursue possible alternative to demolition. The Commission may request assistance from the Department of Planning and Zoning and other parties, public or private, in creating a plan to retain the structure."

The Applicant has indicated it will be costly to repair the building. Staff understands the desire to daylight the river, which would then be visible from the new deck at 3709 Old Columbia Pike. The main Taylor Antique Mall building and the adjacent building at 3709 Old Columbia Pike that are to remain are in need of rehabilitation and this will be a very beneficial project.

However, the renovations to 3711 Old Columbia Pike, including structural and interior cosmetic repairs, could all be covered by the State and Federal 20% income tax credits (40% total if both are utilized). Additionally, all exterior and structural repairs to this building are eligible for the County's 25% historic tax credit, and pending funding, the front façade could utilize Façade Improvement Program funds (which pay up to \$10,000 per applicant per building, if funds are available).

Staff is concerned about the demolition of a highly visible building along the main commercial corridor, which has not yet happened except due to fire. This building is even more visible because it is three stories and the removal would alter the scale of the streetscape. This is a very important and highly visible corner as well. Based on the Standards of Review in Section 16.607, the building is historically and architectural significant to the surrounding area.

An alternative plan to demolishing the historic building at 3711 Old Columbia Pike would be to remove the modern post-war addition to the back of the Taylor Building and construct the deck there, which would offer more expansive views of the river and landscape. The deck could even be two stories. If the post-war addition remains, the view of the river remains blocked regardless.

Staff has no objection to the removal of the tree. While the Guidelines recommend against, "removing live trees with a diameter of 12 inches or greater 4.5 feet above ground level," this tree should not have been growing in this area in the first place, was never a planned planting and could be a hindrance to the safety of people during this renovation project

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends denial of the application to demolish the building, but recommends the Applicant file a new application to demolish the modern addition on the main Taylor Antique Building.

Testimony: The Applicants are already sworn in. Mr. Hauser asked if the Applicant had any additional comments. Mr. Reuwer stated the building is in very bad shape. A structural engineer checked the

building and it would be a significant amount of costs to save it. Mr. Reuwer feels opening up the view of the river would be more beneficial for the town. Mr. Hauser asked Mr. Short to give his opinion of the structure. Mr. Short believes the building dates to the 1920s or early 1930s. He explained that the building continues the long-standing pattern which is seen in the Taylor furniture store as well. There is a shop downstairs and a dwelling above. There is a side entrance for the above residence with a stairway going up. The two stories above would not seem any different than a house in or around Ellicott City at the time. The rooms are slightly odd due to the arrangement of the lot; it is like a trapezoid which makes it a unique space. The building is generally intact as was built. The first story is a commercial open space with a pressed metal ceiling on it.

Ms. Tennor asked why the condition of the building is more deteriorated than the other adjacent buildings. Mr. Short stated that would have to be answered by a structural engineer. It is possible that being over the river could be a contributing factor for deterioration. Ms. Tennor asked if the Applicant had any thoughts on the condition being more deteriorated. Mr. Reuwer said he does not think the building is more deteriorated; it is not in any worse shape inside than the other buildings. He said it has no insulation and the ceilings are crumbling, but is structurally intact. Mr. Reuwer said it would be possible to rehab it, but it could be more beneficial to remove it. Mr. Hauser asked how removing this building might affect the adjoining buildings. Mr. Reuwer stated the buildings all have independent walls, so there should be no problem. Ms. Badart asked about the tree to be removed. Mr. Reuwer stated the tree is growing in the wall. The tree needs to be removed before the wall is destroyed.

Mr. Hauser is divided on whether to save the old building but likes the idea of opening up the view of the river. If a majority of the people in Ellicott City would prefer to see the river, then Mr. Hauser would lean for removing the building. Ms. Badart asked if there is a need for a decision to be made at this time about the building for the development process. Mr. Reuwer stated no, but would like to decide within six months. Mr. Crozier is also divided about the building. He said that a lot of the river is buried so opening the river would give the public a visual access of the river running through Ellicott City. Ms. Tennor does not feel that removing the building will be a problem, but the other buildings may be a problem. If the building is removed, the river will be nice to see but not the side of the other building. Mr. Shad is also divided about the building being removed, but is glad the building is not be demolished by neglect. Mr. Shad would lean more toward demolition.

Mr. Taylor clarified for the record that the Applicants are withdrawing all of application 14-07, except the request to remove a tree which is growing up from the river between the Taylor's main building, the stone building and a neighboring property.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the removal of the tree and accept the amendment of the application to advisory comments for the demolition. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Other Business

Mr. Hauser swore in Grace Kubofcik, a member of the Ellicott City Historic District Partnership Board. She said an attempt was made to send out information about the hearing tonight. Ms. Kubofcik invited Mr. Reuwer to a couple of upcoming meetings so information about the plans can be presented to residents and requested that pictures be provided. Ms. Kubofcik commented that it is difficult for many people to take time to come into the office to view files, so even though the written information is good on the web site, it would be helpful if a picture or two could also be posted online.

Preservation Plan and Code Changes

- 1) Discuss proposed Preservation Plan and Code Changes. HDC Letter of support for the Plan and Code changes to be signed if HDC is in favor of Plan.

Ms. Burgess stated the Commission had discussed the Historic Preservation Plan and Code Changes back in December. The plan was also shown at the Historic Preservation Advocates meeting to obtain their feedback. The changes were submitted and edits were sent back. This is the final draft. Staff would like a more formal endorsement of the plan and have a letter which the Commission will sign. The letter will go to Council for support. The hope is to have the plan pre-filed in February to come before the Council in March.

Mr. Hauser moved to endorse the final amended Howard County Historic Preservation Plan. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved. Mr. Hauser moved to support the Code changes of the Historic Preservation Commission. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Benjamin Moore Paint What Matters

- 1) Ellicott City was recently chosen to be part of the Benjamin Moore contest, Paint What Matters. As a result of being chosen in this contest, part of Main Street will be painted. The County has been working with Benjamin Moore to establish a time frame for this project, as well help coordinate any work that must be done ahead of time, such as having the Historic District Commission approve paint colors. The County was recently given a paint palette that Benjamin Moore picked out for Ellicott City. The scope of work is still to be determined. The purpose of this discussion is for the Commission to review the paint palette and determine if there are any colors that should be avoided.

Ms. Holmes stated that Ellicott City was chosen as one of the towns from the 'paint what matters' competition. Benjamin Moore has now provided a paint palette. Ms. Holmes said that some colors were not provided to them in the larger format. Mr. Hauser said the palette contains some colors that should be removed. Ms. Holmes stated there are several shades of reds. Mr. Hauser stated there are not enough variety of colors. Ms. Holmes stated information needs to be given to Benjamin Moore on what colors will work and which ones do not. Mr. Hauser would like to see more whites. Ms. Tennor asked where the color palette come from. Ms. Holmes said Benjamin Moore chose the colors based on their observations of the town. Mr. Shad commented that consideration should be given to colors needed since the entire town will not be painted, only select buildings. The Commission liked and disliked several colors on the palette. The Commission unanimously agreed to eliminate the Yours Truly pink and Americana blue. Mr. Hauser would like to see as many shades of historic muted colors as possible. There were several bright colors, such as Dragons Blood, a red orange, that the Commission said would be best used as accent colors.

Mr. Hauser moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved. The meeting was adjourned at 9:33 p.m.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Joseph Hauser, Chairperson

Carol Stirn, Recording Secretary



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ELlicott CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov
410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-1655
TDD 410-313-2323

March Minutes

The second regular meeting for the year 2014 of the Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, March 6, 2014 in the C. Vernon Gray Room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, Maryland.

Members present: Joseph Hauser, Chair; Sam Crozier, Vice-Chair; Lisa Badart; Eileen Tennor; and Allan Shad

Members absent: None

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Dan Bennett, Lewis Taylor, and Carol Stirn

Chairman Joseph Hauser opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules of the meeting. Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the February 6, 2014 minutes. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. 14-08 – 8180 Main Street, Ellicott City
2. 14-09 – 9309 Whiskey Bottom Road, Laurel, HO-801
3. 14-10 – 8391 Main Street, Ellicott City
4. 14-11 – 3615 Fels Lane, Ellicott City, MD
5. 14-12 – 3776 Church Road, Ellicott City
6. 14-13 – 8312 Main Street (Parking Lot E), Ellicott City

CONSENT AGENDA

14-08 – 8180 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs/alterations. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: Enalee Bounds/Lissa Bounds

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT, the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to replace all exterior wood shutters with new wood shutters to match the existing in style and size. The wood shutters are in very poor condition and are beyond repair. The Applicant also proposes to replace all of the rotted trim on the windows and doors of the 1st and 2nd floor of the building. The new woodwork will be painted to match the existing colors.

The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement Program funds for the work.

Staff Comments: The replacement of the deteriorated shutters complies with Chapter 6.I (page 42) recommendations, “for replacements, install shutters or blinds that maintain the size, style and

placement of the original.” Additionally, the in-kind replacement of the shutters is considered Routine Maintenance (page 42), “installing new shutters or blinds that exactly match the existing ones.”

The replacement of the rotten trim on the windows and doors also complies with Chapter 6.H (page 40) recommendations for windows, “when repair is not possible, replace original windows, frames and related details with features that fit the original openings and are of the same style, material, finish and window pane configuration.” The replacement of the door trim is consistent with Chapter 6.G (page 38) recommendations for Routine Maintenance, “replacing entrance features with materials that exactly match the existing materials.”

The proposed work is eligible for tax credits per Section 20.112 of the County Code.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Façade Improvement Program Recommendation: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds and receipt of two quotes for the work. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the application as per Staff recommendations. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

14-09 – 9309 Whiskey Bottom Road, Laurel, HO-801

Advisory comments for subdivision, some demolition.

Applicant: Timothy Miller, KCI Technologies, Inc.

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT, the main historic house dates to 1870. The Applicant proposes to subdivide the 2.94 acre site into a total of four lots. Three of the lots will be buildable lots and the fourth lot will contain the existing historic house. A garage and outbuilding will be demolished. The new lots will be located behind the historic house, abutting the North Laurel Community Center.

The three new buildable lots will be approximately 6,000 square feet each. The historic house will remain on a 68,375 square foot lot.

Staff Comments: The new lots are being created behind the historic house, which is the most appropriate location. The primary views of the historic house will not be disturbed, however, the new homes will be visible in the background. There does not appear to be any landscape buffers to shield the new development. Staff recommends a native evergreen landscape buffer be planted in front of the new driveway of the new lots, to provide screening.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends a native evergreen landscape buffer be planted in front of the new driveway for the new lots, to provide screening.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Brian Aloï of KCI Technologies. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Aloï said that his boss was not yet there, but he was expecting him. Mr. Aloï said that no evergreens are being used and that the owner would prefer to use crape myrtle. He explained there will be a board-on-board fence along the driveway, running behind the historic house and blocking the view of the new houses. Trees will be planted along the fenceline on the side of the house where the historic property is located. Trees will also be placed near the three homes. Mr. Aloï said the houses will be designed to look like a historic house and not resemble a modern house. He said that trees will be planted along Whiskey Bottom Road.

Mr. Taylor said that it may be better to wait until the Applicant has arrived so he can be included in the discussion. Mr. Hauser stated this case will be put on hold until Mr. Miller has arrived.

Mr. Miller arrived and the case was resumed. Mr. Hauser swore in Timothy Miller of KCI. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Miller reiterated that the homeowner of the historic house would prefer the crape myrtle over the evergreens. If evergreens are preferred, the homeowner would be willing to accept this. Ms. Badart asked if the screening would be located on the property containing the historic home. Mr. Miller stated yes. Mr. Tennor asked if the planting would be inside the fence. Mr. Miller said correct. Mr. Hauser asked about landscaping plans for the new lots. Mr. Miller stated plans are in the works and will meet County Code for the lots. Mr. Crozier stated another type of fence should be used, instead of the board-on-board fence. He said there needs to be a fence that is compatible with the architecture and layout of the four houses and the board-on-board would be the least compatible. Mr. Miller asked the Commission if a split rail fence would be acceptable, with either evergreens or crape myrtles. The owner would like to add some color in the plantings.

Mr. Crozier asked about the architecture of the houses. Mr. Miller stated the homeowner is requesting the new homes look somewhat like the historic house with some of the historic features with “gingerbread” detail on the porches. Mr. Crozier commented there are many pre-made fences which would fit in with the homes, and does not object to using the crape myrtles to add color. Ms. Tennor agreed that more of the screening should be vegetative in nature. The other Commission members also agreed.

14-10 – 8391 Main Street, Ellicott City

Replace exterior door, repair sidelights and transom. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: David Stratmann

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1920. The Applicant proposes to replace the main front door and repair the sidelights and transom. The existing front door is a 6 panel wood door, painted red. The door will be replaced in-kind to match. There are two sidelights, one on each side of the front door. The sidelights contain three lites and one panel. The transom over the door has four lites. The sidelights and transom will be repaired. The application states these items will be replaced, but after talking with Staff, the Applicant has agreed to repair them, as they appear in good condition with only some minor issues.

The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement Program funds for the work.

Staff Comments: The repair of the sidelights and transom complies with Chapter 6.G (page 37) recommendations, “maintain and repair original doors, frames, sills, lintels, side lights and transoms.” The sidelights and transom appear to be in good condition and only require minor repair to the mullions.

The replacement of the door complies with Chapter 6.G (page 37) recommendations, “when repair is not possible, replace historic doors and entrance features with features of the same size, style and finish.” The Applicant has indicated the existing front door was installed by the previous owners and is an interior door that does not open or close properly and has air gaps between the existing frame and door.

The repair of the sidelights and transom and new front door is eligible for tax credits per Section 20.112 of the County Code.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the repair of the existing sidelight and transom for tax credit pre-approval and approval of a new 6 panel wooden front door, also for tax credit pre-approval.

Façade Improvement Program Recommendation: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust and availability of funds. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: Ms. Holmes said that the Applicant was not able to attend. The Applicant originally applied to replace the entire door, frame, transom and sidelights. Ms. Holmes explained that when Staff conducted site visits, they noticed the doorframe was in good condition with just a few areas requiring minor repairs. Staff asked Mr. Stratmann if he was agreeable to just replacing the door and making the repairs. The Applicant did agree to this. Mr. Hauser asked about the colors. Ms. Holmes said the colors will remain the same. The Commission had no other comments.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as per Staff recommendations. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-11– 3615 Fels Lane, Ellicott City

Construct addition, exterior alterations.

Applicant: Mark Andersen

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1910. The Applicant proposes to remove a one story, 12 foot wide by 6 foot deep bumpout on the rear of the house and construct a new by 24 foot wide by 8 feet deep addition. This addition will consist of a 12 foot wide by 8 foot deep kitchen expansion and a 12 foot wide by 8 foot deep porch. The new addition will be the width of the house. The addition will be located at the rear of the house and will not be visible from the public right-of-way. The house itself is not highly visible from Fels Lane as it sits above Fels Lane and is accessed from the neighboring apartment complex.

The existing house has asbestos shingle siding. The Applicant proposes to install HardiePlank lap siding on the new addition. The portion containing the kitchen addition will have one white vinyl 1:1 window and white HardiePlank lap siding. The fascia boards and risers on the steps will also be wood, painted white. The new roof on the addition will be GAF asphalt 3-tab roof shingles in the color weathered gray. Five inch white aluminum gutters will also be installed. The new entry door to the porch will be a 9 lite white steel door. A rubbed bronze exterior light will be added next to the door.

The rear porch portion of the addition will be built adjacent to the existing rear wall. The porch railings

and posts will be wood painted white. The ceiling on the porch will be wood bead board ceiling, painted blue to match the front porch ceiling. The porch floor will be constructed with Azek in the color slate.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 7.A recommendations for new construction: addition and porches. The new addition will be constructed on the rear of the home and is subordinate to the main historic structure. The addition complies with Chapter 7.A (page 52) recommendations, “attach additions to the side or rear of a historic building to avoid altering the primary façade, design additions so that the form and integrity of the historic structure would be unimpaired if the addition were to be removed in the future, and design additions in manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new.” The application does not specify the type of HardiePlank lap siding to be used, but Staff recommends the smooth finish be used, instead of the cedarmill grained finish, so that it does not clash with the grain of the asbestos siding on the historic house. This would also distinguish the addition as new. The addition also complies with Chapter 7.A recommendation, “design an addition to be subordinate to the historic building in size, height, scale and details and to allow the form of the original structure to be seen.”

The proposed vinyl windows comply with the Guidelines because they will be located on the rear of the building, they will not be visible from the public way, and there are vinyl windows on the building. The windows comply with Chapter 6.H (page 41) recommendations, “vinyl windows may be acceptable for modern additions to historic buildings if the addition is to the rear of the building with little visibility from public ways or neighboring properties.”

The proposed steel door on the rear of the house complies with Chapter 6.G (page 38) recommendations, “many historic buildings have secondary entrances not visible from streets or other properties. Where these entrances already have a modern replacement door, a new door does not necessarily need to be of a historically appropriate style.” The existing bumpout contains a modern door as well.

The HardiePlank siding complies with Chapter 7.A recommendations, “aluminum, vinyl or another substitute siding may be acceptable if already used on the existing building.” The building is currently covered in asbestos siding, so the use of HardiePlank will not be the first modern siding material introduced on the building. The use of HardiePlank will distinguish the new addition from the historic building.

The exterior light complies with Chapter 9.E (page 71) recommendations, “choose and locate lighting fixtures to be visually unobtrusive. Use dark metal or a similar material” and “place attached lighting fixtures in traditional locations next to or over a door.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted, with the use of smooth HardiePlank siding.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser recused himself from this case. Ms. Badart swore in Julia Hawrylo. Ms. Badart asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Hawrylo stated the contractor was supposed to be in attendance but was not able to come. Ms. Hawrylo explained that she asked the contractor about the HardiePlank smooth siding recommendation. The contractor stated the intention is to use the smooth siding. Mr. Shad asked if the area under the porch addition is to remain open. Ms. Hawrylo stated under the bumpout it is currently open, but is not really sure what will be done. Mr. Shad and Ms. Holmes both said they thought the plans show it open. The porch floor will be insulated. Mr. Taylor asked to clarify that the applicant indicated the smooth HardiePlank siding will be used. The applicant stated yes.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to Approve the application as submitted, with the stipulation the Applicant follow the recommendations made by Staff regarding the smooth HardiePlank. If any changes occur to the outside appearance of the porch and bumpout, the Applicant must contact Staff for approval. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-12 – 3776 Church Road, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: Mark Andersen

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the house dates to 1980. The house is located on Church Road, but is not highly visible from the street due to the topography. The house is located on a hill, set back from the street. The rear of the house faces Mt. Ida, which is located on Sarah's Lane.

The Applicant proposes to add a 12 foot wide by 10 foot deep deck off of the first floor on the front of the house. The deck will be constructed out of pressure treated framing lumber and western red cedar decking and rails. An existing window will be removed and replaced with a double 15 lite steel French door. There is an existing storage area under where the deck is proposed to be constructed. This area will be enclosed with HardiePlank siding and a new solid steel door painted white. This door will not be full height, due to the space restrictions.

On the west side of the house three existing windows will be removed and four 6:6 vinyl windows will be added. An awning will be removed above the existing three windows. The lower storage area is not currently enclosed, HardiePlank siding will be added here as well.

The Applicant also proposes to remove two decks on the rear of the house (facing Mt. Ida) and add a 9 foot wide by 6 foot deep covered porch on the rear entrance. The porch will also be constructed out of western red cedar. The green awnings on the windows will be removed. The shutters will also be removed from the rear of the house. The existing door will be replaced with a new 9 lite steel door, which will match the existing. The second door will be removed and covered with HardiePlank siding. One of the windows will be made smaller to accommodate some interior functions.

Staff Comments: While the materials proposed are not typical for the historic district, this is a rare house that is not historic. Section 16.607 of the County Code explains, "it is also the intent of this subtitle that the Commission shall be lenient in its judgment of plans for structures of little historic value or plans for new construction, except where such plans would seriously impair the historic or architectural value of surrounding structures or the surrounding area." Due to the limited visibility of this house from Church Road, Staff has no objection to the modern materials as the house is set back far enough from the street that it will not be possible to tell what the materials are. Additionally, the overall proposal will improve the appearance of the 1980s house, and would not impair the architectural value of the surrounding area.

The continued use of the HardiePlank siding complies with Chapter 6.D recommendations, "composite siding materials may be used to replace wood siding on non-historic buildings if the particular material proposed is compatible in appearance with the building itself and with wood siding used on nearby historic buildings." The building is already covered in a fiber cement siding, and the continued use of it is appropriate. The application does not indicate the style of HardiePlank siding to be used, but Staff recommends smooth to match the existing.

The use of vinyl windows is also appropriate because the building is not historic, the material will be not be definable from the street, and the existing windows on the building are vinyl. The windows comply

with Chapter 6.H recommendations, “vinyl windows may be acceptable for modern additions to historic buildings if the addition is to the rear of the building with little visibility from public ways or neighboring properties.” In this case, the entire building is modern and currently uses the proposed materials. While changing the size of window openings is not recommended for historic buildings, in this case it will improve the appearance of the modern structure.

The removal of the existing rear decks and construction of the two new decks complies with Chapter 7.B (page 54) recommendations, “design new porches and decks to be simple, compatible in design with the existing building and in scale with the existing building in size and roof height.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted, with the use of smooth HardiePlank siding.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Emily Kowalski. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Kowalski stated yes. She said that a picture window will be added to the front of the house; the shed door will be covered with siding so the doors blends in; and they would like to remove all shutters from the house. She said they would also like to paint the house gray, with a white trim outlining the windows. Ms. Badart asked if the rear porch to be installed is in the same footprint as the existing deck. Mr. Hauser swore in Matthew Kowalski. Mr. Kowalski stated the porch will be slightly smaller. Ms. Holmes asked if the applicant would be painting the existing HardiePlank or order it painted. Mr. Kowalski stated he would probably paint it. Ms. Badart asked if the HardiePlank will be smooth. Mr. Kowalski stated yes, there is no problem with the Staff recommendation to use smooth HardiePlank.

Mr. Hauser asked if the Commission would have any problems with a motion allowing the Applicant to replace the shutters in-kind or would the applicant have to come back if shutters were to be added back. Mr. Hauser feels there should be an option in the event, after the painting is done, the trim looks too small. Mr. Taylor suggested, for the record, that instead of adding items to a motion the application be amended to include the amended items.

Motion: Mr. Hauser stated application 14-12 is being amended, with the Applicant’s approval. The Applicant will be removing all the shutters on the house, but with the option to reinstall the shutters without having to return to Staff for approval. Siding will be added to the storage doors to blend in the wall. The house will be painted gray, but the house paint color and the color for any future shutters needs to be submitted to Staff for approval. A picture window will be added, and a door will be added. Mr. Hauser asked if the Applicant was satisfied with the application changes. The Applicant stated yes.

Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the application per the Staff recommendations and the new changes. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-13 – 8312 Main Street (Parking Lot E), Ellicott City

Landscape plan.

Applicant: Mark Richmond, Howard County Bureau of Environmental Services, Public Works

Background & Scope of Work: Last month the Applicant was approved to make alterations to Parking Lot E. This application contains the finished landscape plan. The entire hillside will be landscaped with a mix of deciduous trees, flowering trees, shrubs, grasses, perennials, groundcover, turfgrass sod and bulbs.

The landscape plan shows that there will be a total of 38 different plants used in the landscape. There

will be a total of 12 trees added back into the site, to include red maple, river birch, redbud and crape myrtle. There will be 14 species of shrubs, 3 species of grasses, 14 species of perennials, 1 species of groundcover, sod and bulbs.

The plant list has been tailored specifically to this site. Some plants are selected for wet areas used in the bio-retention area like dwarf Joe Pye Weed, Common Rush and River Oats. Other plants were selected for the sunny dry slopes like the Switchgrass, Phlox, Sedum and Clover. More than most landscape plans, this plant selection offers a variety of color, bloom and seasonal interest. The landscape will offer a four season display: Daffodils, Phlox and Redbuds in the spring; Coreopsis, Black Eyed Susan, Liatris and Crape Myrtles in summer; Sedum, Aster, and Red Maple in fall and Winterberry, Red Twig Dogwood and River Birch bark in winter with many species offering more than one season of interest like the Chokeberry and Viburnum having spring blooms and fall fruit. A small portion of sod is being used in the run-off area adjacent to Court Avenue to prevent erosion but the slope will not have sod for any type of weekly mowing or maintenance.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 9.B (page 65) recommendations, “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.” There are many native plants used in the plan. The location of the plantings complies with Chapter 9.B (page 65) recommendations, “plant new trees and shrubs far enough from buildings to avoid moisture problems and damage to the buildings from falling limbs and roots as the plants grow.” The trees are not located next to any building, and were chosen for their compact size, to avoid overgrowth in this small site. Trees with minimal limb debris were selected knowing pedestrians and cars will be throughout the site. The Department of Recreation and Parks (DRP) has reviewed the planting list and has had the opportunity to suggest plant species, which helped complete this planting plan. A maintenance plan to mulch the first few years and water for the first year will be part of the scope of work for the success of this installation which will help DRP maintain the site. The original plan called for 1 gallon containers spaced 1 foot on-center and yielded more than 3,000 perennials. Staff recommended 1 gallon containers spaced 2 feet on-center and the compromise has been to install 1 quart containers 1 foot on-center, so the plants will grow in dense and will become a mulch free slope in the future. The plan that was approved last month called for the removal of 22 trees, half of them previously planted evergreens and the other half self-seeding shrub/scrub trees growing along the road and under the powerlines. This landscaping plan complies with Chapter 9.B recommendations, “retain mature trees and shrubs. Provide for their replacement when necessary.” Due to the construction taking place, the existing trees could not be retained, but half will be replaced and be planted in a more appropriate area for the health of the trees and for safety because of their stability from falling. Overall, the landscape plan provides for more beneficial landscaping and a more attractive environment that previously existed.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Mark Richmond, DPW, and Kyle Mundy of McCormick Taylor. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Neither person had any changes. Mr. Hauser swore in Dee Dee Lancelotta and David Barber. Ms. Lancelotta stated they are concerned because their house faces the parking lot. She said the large trees were put in years ago as a screen for the parking lot. If the screening is removed, she believes it will affect the value of her home. Ms. Lancelotta stated they do not have any problem with the project, as it will be an enhancement to the area, but do not want to end up looking at cars in a parking lot. Mr. Hauser asked Mark Richmond to address this issue.

Mr. Richmond stated he has been reviewing this situation for a solution, but continues to run into more constraints than opportunities. The bio-retention cannot have large trees planted near it due to

problems from roots getting into the under drain system, which is considered a utility. There are several overhead lines which need to be avoided by trees. The bio-retention system had to be fit into the area so there is not much area left to install large trees. There is concern about planting trees near the existing walls in order to maintain the stability of the walls. The area above the wall next to Court Avenue was looked at; there is a thin strip of land which is too small to plant large trees. There is also concern with site distance. Even if a hedgerow was planted to help with screening, it could also cause a sight distance problem with drivers not seeing around the corner. Many solutions have site constraints. One idea is to plant a few trees, depending on the type of trees, in the corner of the bio-retention area. Another option is to plant screening directly on the owner's property.

Ms. Lancelotta stated they do not want any planting on their property. Mr. Hauser asked if there was any possibility of putting a couple of canopy trees at the bottom of the hill. This would still help put a canopy over the top of the parking lot so residents on the hillside would only see the plantings, not the parking area. The location would be right down near the paved area. Mr. Barber likes the idea, but does not want to see any asphalt..

Mr. Crozier asked if the bio-retention was moved could the trees remain. Mr. Richmond stated yes. Mr. Crozier feels it would be easier to relocate the bio-retention. He commented the size of the trees to be planted are small calipers and will take too long to mature to the scale of the trees now. A major problem with the planting plan is there are no evergreens trees over 3 to 4 feet high. He said the best way to make the area more substantial is with trees and suggested removing some of the budget for the small plantings and replace with larger trees with 3-4 inch or 4-5 inch calipers. The area is too over-shrubbed and needs more tree variety. Mr. Richmond stated he is open to investigating other plant species. In regard to the bio-retention, there is really no other spot on site that would be a good location. Ms. Lancelotta would prefer to see the bio-retention area relocated. Mr. Barber commented that the front porch of the house is about 30 to 50 feet in elevation above the bio-retention area so it is going to be difficult to cover the area. The current pine trees screen the area perfectly.

Mr. Hauser asked Mr. Richmond what kind of time constraints there are right now and asked if there is time to rethink the bio-retention area. Mr. Richmond stated there is time to change the trees, but really no time to redesign the bio-retention with the current schedule. Ms. Burgess stated the concern for the pine trees when they do fully mature is for the trees to physically fit in the area with their root systems and being constrained by the walls. This concern arose before any discussion about bio-retention. Parking cannot be reduced. There was the need to have the stairwell in place to connect the parking lot to Main Street. Ms. Burgess explained that the parking lot is in a floodplain and that Maryland Department of the Environment will not allow any height to be added to the asphalt area. Ms. Burgess is not sure where else the bio-retention area could be located in order to do its job. Mr. Richmond said the trees and walls may be a problem later so this must be fixed now. Mr. Crozier feels there is room for improvement with the project. Mr. Taylor reminded that the Commission approved all the work at the previous meeting and the only item open for consideration is the landscaping plan.

Mr. Hauser asked Mr. Richmond to discuss this issue with his office and come up with some possible solutions, then get together with Staff and the neighbors and have a discussion. Mr. Taylor asked if the homeowners had any questions for the Applicants. Mr. Barber asked if they could install large caliper trees if there was not time to move the bio-retention area. Mr. Richmond said he could look into larger trees. Ms. Lancelotta asked if changing the bio-retention was an option. Mr. Richmond stated the current placement is best for the site with all its constraints. Mr. Hauser requested Mr. Richmond to discuss this with the engineers. Mr. Richmond will review the bio-retention and plant material.

Mr. Hauser confirmed that both Staff and the homeowners agree to a meeting with DPW. Both Staff and the homeowners agreed. For the record, Mr. Taylor asked if the Applicant agrees to a continuous of the

application which will be heard at the next HDC meeting on the first Thursday of April. The Applicant agreed.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Continue the application to next month's meeting. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Mr. Hauser moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Crozier seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 9:07 p.m.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Joseph Hauser, Chairperson

Carol Stirn, Recording Secretary



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ELlicott City Historic District ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov
410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-1655
TDD 410-313-2323

April Minutes

The third regular meeting for the year 2014 of the Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, April 3, 2014 in the C. Vernon Gray Room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, Maryland.

Members present: Joseph Hauser, Chair; Sam Crozier, Vice-Chair; Lisa Badart; Eileen Tennor; and Allan Shad

Members absent: None

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Dan Bennett, Lewis Taylor, and Lisa Kenney

Chairman Joseph Hauser opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules of the meeting. Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the March 6, 2014 minutes. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. 13-37c – 10375 Cavey Lane, Woodstock, HO-770
2. 13-09c – 8357 Main Street, Ellicott City
3. 14-14 – 3776 Church Road, Ellicott City
4. 14-15 – 6375 Ten Oaks Road, Clarksville (delayed till May)
5. 14-16 – 3771 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City
6. 14-17 – 8085 Main Street, Ellicott City
7. 14-18 – 2106 McKendree Road, West Friendship, HO-192
8. 14-19 – 8202 Main Street, Ellicott City
9. 14-13 – 8312 Main Street (Parking Lot E), Ellicott City – continued from March

CONSENT AGENDA

13-37c – 10375 Cavey Lane, Woodstock, HO-770

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Alice M. Bender

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT, the structure dates to 1910 and is not located in a historic district, but is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-770. The Applicant seeks final tax credits for the work that was pre-approved in September 2013 to replace the front porch roof, which was covered in asphalt shingles with a medium bronze standing seam metal roof. The Applicant was also approved to remove a black asphalt roll roof and replace it with the bronze standing seam metal roof.

The invoice shows that \$7,200.94 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$1,800.94 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The work complies with that pre-approved and the invoices add up to the requested amount.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the application per staff recommendations. Ms. Badart seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of \$1,800.94 in final tax credits.

13-09c – 8357 Main Street, Ellicott City

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Jane O’Leary

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1900. The Applicant seeks final tax credits for work that was pre-approved in March 2013 to repoint mortar on the front façade, re-set existing granite steps, replace front entry doors and hardware, and repaint the cellar doors, entry doors, jambs, window trim and dormers.

The invoices show that \$6,670.30 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$667.03 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: There is a materials charge on the Tri State Homes invoice for \$85.00. Staff confirmed with the Applicant that the cost was for the exterior of the doors. Therefore, that is an eligible expense and increases the total spent on eligible work to \$6,675.30 for a tax credit of \$675.53.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of \$675.53 in final tax credits.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the application per staff recommendations. Ms. Badart seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-14 – 3776 Church Road, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: Emily Kowalski

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the house dates to 1980. The Applicant was approved in March 2014 to make several alterations to the house. The Applicant now seeks approval to change the door on the rear of the house from a 6-lite steel door to a full lite steel door with built in blinds. On the side of the house facing Church Road, the Applicant proposes to make two existing windows larger in order to match the other new windows on the house. The new windows will be 6:6 vinyl to match the other new windows that were approved last month.

Staff Comments: Section 16.607 of the County Code explains, “it is also the intent of this subtitle that the Commission shall be lenient in its judgment of plans for structures of little historic value or plans for new construction, except where such plans would seriously impair the historic or architectural value of surrounding structures or the surrounding area.” Staff finds the proposed changes will not impair the architectural integrity of the area and will improve the appearance of the 1980s house. The full lite door and larger windows will be compatible with the style of the house and the other changes taking place.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the application per staff recommendations. Ms. Badart seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

14-16 – 3771 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City

Construct addition

Applicant: Richard Espy

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the house dates to 1798. The Applicant proposes to expand an existing rear addition and convert it into a four-season enclosed deck. The expansion will not connect to any part of the historic house. The expansion will be constructed using the same building materials that are on the existing addition, so that the expansion will blend in seamlessly. The addition will be 25 feet wide, which is the width of the current addition, and 20 feet deep (not counting the depth of the current addition). There is an existing staircase and landing on the current addition on the west side of the house that will be expanded into a porch. The staircase will be moved to the center of the new porch, which will run the length of the current and proposed addition. The proposed addition will match the current addition in design and materials as follows:

- 1) Roof _ Cedar shake shingles
- 2) Windows – Andersen wood windows in white. Three 5x5 picture windows on rear and two double hung 1:1 (one on each side).
- 3) Siding – HardiePlank Gray, 6 inch exposure
- 4) Doors – Thermatru Smooth Star, full lite white wood
- 5) Porch light – Copper Fixture
- 6) Addition foundation – No foundation; addition set on 6”x6” wood posts to allow light into the existing basement windows
- 7) Porch – Azek slate gray flooring and Timbertech composite 4”x4” white square posts with pyramid caps

Staff Comments: The application is consistent with Chapter 7 recommendations for new additions. The addition complies with Chapter 7.A (page 52) recommendations, “attach addition to the side or rear of a historic building to avoid altering the primary façade” and “design additions so that the form and integrity of the historic structure would be unimpaired if the addition were to be removed in the future.” The addition will be constructed on the rear of the home and will only disturb an existing modern addition.

The proposed windows and doors will match the existing addition and comply with Chapter 7.A (page 52) recommendations, “design windows to be similar in size, proportion and arrangement to the existing windows” and “use doors and simple entrance designs that are compatible with those on the existing building or similar buildings nearby.”

The proposed materials for the proposed addition are already found on the existing addition and comply with Chapter 7.A (page 53) recommendations, “on any building, use exterior materials and colors similar to or compatible with the texture and color of those on the existing building.”

The extension of the side porch complies with Chapter 7.B (page 54) recommendations, “design new porches and decks to be simple, compatible in design with the existing building and in scale with the existing building in size and roof height.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Mr. and Mrs. Richard Espy. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the staff comments. Ms. Espy stated that her contractor suggested keeping the stairs in front of the door in order to be able to move furniture in and out of the house, instead of centering them on the deck.

Ms. Holmes stated that Inspections, License and Permits (DILP) had concerns regarding using extra cross braces under the addition. Mr. Bennett explained DILP’s structural concerns and that DILP will notify the contractor to build the extra bracing if needed.

Mr. Hauser asked if all materials and colors are staying the same. Ms. Espy stated that all colors and materials would be the same. She said the entire façade would be painted grey so it would be a seamless transition from the old addition to the new addition.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve per staff comments and as amended with the location of the stairs. Mr. Shad seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-17– 8085 Main Street, Ellicott City

Construct rear deck

Applicant: Evan Brown

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1920. In July 2013 the Applicant was approved to build a rear two tier deck. The plans for the deck have changed and the current proposal is to build a one level deck. The deck will be constructed out of pressure treated lumber and will not be painted, but left as natural wood. The deck will have composite white railings, as originally proposed. The deck will be one level, extending the length of the yard, with a staircase at the rear door of the building to provide access the deck. The deck may sit 6 inches to 1 foot higher than the existing walkway, in order to properly construct the deck foundation above the retaining wall. The existing staircase from St. Paul Street will remain and connect to the deck, as originally proposed.

The only change from the original approved deck is there will no longer be a lower tiered deck, as the entire deck will sit at the height of the previous second tier. The current proposed deck will be longer as a result of removing the lower deck and installing the staircase closer to the building, instead of the stairs being part of the deck as previously approved.

The Applicant also proposes to build a privacy fence on the east side of the property, which does not adjoin a building, but a neighboring yard. The privacy fence will match the neighbor’s existing privacy fence. The west side of the property is adjacent to another structure. As mentioned above, the deck may sit 6 inches to 1 foot higher than the existing walkway. There are windows on the adjacent west side building that will look directly into the deck space. The windows will not be covered by the deck, but interior functions could be disturbed. The deck will contain small, round stainless steel step lights at various locations.

Staff Comments: The proposed deck complies with Chapter 7.B (page 54) recommendations, which explain that “proposals to add decks of unpainted, pressure-treated wood to the rear of historic buildings are not uncommon. Although these additions are obviously modern, they usually obscure little

of the building façade and require little change to historic building features. Decks should not be added to a building's primary façade or a façade highly visible from a public way." The proposed deck will be added to the rear of the building. While the rear of the building fronts on St. Paul Street, it is a very steep slope and won't be as visible as it would be on grade with St. Paul Street. The current proposed deck is very similar to the one originally approved, but is only one tier instead of two.

The Guidelines also indicate that decks should be substantial in appearance, having more of the character of a porch (avoid decks that appear to stand on toothpicks), and should be related in details as much as possible to the style and character of the building." The footings of the deck will not be visible, but the deck will be built into the terraced hillside, possibly giving more of the impression of a patio.

The step lights comply with Chapter 9.E (page 71) recommendations, "choose and locate lighting fixtures to be visually unobtrusive. Use dark metal or a similar material." While the proposed material is a stainless steel, the lights will be small, unobtrusive and located on a modern deck.

There is one building adjacent to the area that will contain the deck. There are windows on the lower level of this building that will be impacted by the deck. Staff does not know the use of the interior rooms. If the adjacent building owner is concerned about the deck and these windows, the following options could be considered for screening. The Applicant mentioned installing lattice and planting ivy or some other type of climbing plant. Depending on the use of the interior space, a frosted window could be offered to buffer the view between the deck and the interior of the house. Another option could be to install a 3-foot semi-circle well to allow light in, but yet block the view of the deck.

There is a chain link fence along the property line at St. Paul Street that is not in fitting with the historic district. Staff recommends this fence be removed and replaced with a more appropriate fence. The Applicant said that they were thinking of installing the same wooden privacy fence in place of the chain link, to keep the fence styles consistent and the deck more private. The Guidelines (page 70) recommend, "install open fencing, generally not more than five feet high, of wood or dark metal. Use closed wood fences only for side and rear yards in areas where a precedent exists. Construct closed wood fences of painted vertical boards, with straight or angled rather than scalloped tops." There is a wood privacy fence in the neighboring yard, so there is a precedent to continue this style. Staff has no objection to leaving the fence unpainted, which will allow it to weather naturally and match the neighboring fence. Staff also has no objection to using the privacy fence along St. Paul Street, which is the rear of the property, as there is a vertical drop from the sidewalk and the privacy fence will be a safer option than a lower fence. Another option to a privacy fence along St. Paul Street is to install an open black iron or metal fence, which are commonly found in the historic district.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and recommends the Applicant work with the adjacent property owner to figure out a screening solution for the windows. Staff recommends Approval of the removal of the chain link fence along St. Paul Street and the replacement with a wood privacy fence.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Evan Brown. Mr. Hauser asked Mr. Brown if he had any additions or corrections to the staff comment. Mr. Brown presented the Board with a sample solar light that he wishes to use on the outdoor deck. He stated that the adjacent property is for sale and that he would work closely with the new owners to figure out a screening solution.

Mr. Hauser asked if the back fence would be a public entrance access from St. Paul Street. Mr. Brown stated that he would prefer it to not be a public access and he explained that he is working with the County to have a gate for security reasons at night. Mr. Brown explained that the fence must have an emergency egress due to fire codes. Mr. Hauser asked how a privacy fence would work. Mr. Brown stated that the privacy fence would be more secure at the close of business and overnight. He also

stated that he does not want patrons entering from the fence, and if they do, they must walk through the deck, down the stairs and to the front in order to be seated by the hostess.

Ms. Tennor asked if there would be service deliveries and Mr. Brown stated that it is really only an emergency egress and he would secure it at night. Mr. Brown stated he was originally told there could not be a fence or gate at the back. He further explained that due to the historic nature of the property the County wanted an emergency egress. Mr. Brown said he is happy to comply with having the entrance open, as long as he could close and lock at night for security purposes.

Mr. Taylor asked if something happened to the building in the past. Mr. Brown stated that the building did burn to the ground many years ago.

Mr. Hauser asked for clarification on how the design changed from the old design to the current design. Mr. Brown stated that it was a two tier all wood deck and now it will be just one deck. The change was due to the requirements for a wider staircase for emergency egress.

Ms. Tennor asked if the remodeling of the deck created the issue of screening from the adjacent neighbor. Mr. Brown stated that the deck had always interfered with the windows of the adjacent neighbor. Ms. Tennor asked if there is a precedent for staff to facilitate with new owners. Mr. Brown stated that he had meetings with other property owners to discuss his plans but currently the adjacent neighbor's house is for sale. Mr. Brown stated that he is trying to mimic moonlight, to keep the lighting low and less obtrusive.

Mr. Hauser asked about the current situation with runoff and if the new deck would affect that. Mr. Brown stated the deck would not affect runoff, and explained that the deck does sit on footers. Mr. Brown stated that ground cover no longer exists and the area is covered with black tarps to block vegetation growth. He said he has not had any issues with flooding from all the rain received this winter and does not anticipate any runoff issues now.

Ms. Holmes asked how many lights the Applicant anticipates using. Mr. Brown stated that once the deck is built, he will add some lighting and gage how many to use. He said that he does not intend to use any against the neighboring house because there is a streetlight.

Mr. Brown asked the Commission their preference for screening from adjacent neighbors. Mr. Hauser stated that he would like Mr. Brown to work with the new owner of the adjacent property. The Commission said they are approving the screening tonight and he does not need to return to the Commission with it.

Mr. Taylor asked the Commission for clarification of what they are recommending for lighting. Mr. Shad said there is a lighting plan on the deck plans and that would be part of the approval. Mr. Taylor said that although the replacement of the chain link fence with the wooden privacy fence is not on original application, the Applicant would like approval for the option to do that work. Mr. Brown stated the existing chain link fence is not safe and he would like approval to change the fence. Mr. Taylor is noting for the record that a wooden privacy fence is more historically appropriate than a chain link fence.

Mr. Hauser asked what height the privacy fence would be. Mr. Brown stated the fence would be five feet. Mr. Brown said his egress lighting has been approved by DILP and is to code.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to approve the application as submitted with the following contingencies and amendments: to allow for a 5 foot high privacy wood fence along St. Paul Street, contingent upon County permitting and that all the lighting is finalized through County permitting; and to allow for additional solar lights on the deck; otherwise the application is approved as presented. As part of

installing the wooden privacy fence, the chain link fence will be removed. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-18 – 2106 McKendree Road, West Friendship, HO-192

Exterior repairs for tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Steve Allnutt

Background & Scope of Work: According to the Historic Sites Inventory form the house dates to about 1908. The Applicant proposes to make several exterior repairs and seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work. The work will include:

- 1) Paint the exterior siding – the lower clapboard will be painted white and the upper fish scales will be a medium gray tone.
- 2) Sand and repaint existing vinyl shutters black, color will match the existing.
- 3) Paint metal roof black to match existing
- 4) Front door will be painted red.
- 5) Replace exterior lights
- 6) Repair porches and repaint.
- 7) Repoint brick on front steps and two chimneys
- 8) Replace one steel door with new door and refinish existing three doors. Paint Richmond red and add new hardware.
- 9) Replace existing wood and vinyl windows with wood windows.

The following information was included in the application, but is not eligible for tax credits. The Applicant will also clean and repair the other buildings on the site, including the gazebo, pavilion and water feature, however these items are not eligible for tax credits as they are not historic outbuildings. The shrubs and trees will be pruned and landscaping beds restored. The driveway will be blacktopped and the perimeter fence will be repaired. The brick garden columns will be painted white, to match the existing. These items are also not eligible for tax credits as they are landscape items. The Applicant also included repair plans for the rear porch with ceiling fans. However, the porch is modern, as is the addition it is attached to. The repairs of these areas are not eligible for tax credits as they are not historic additions to the building.

Staff Comments: The application is generally consistent with The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation as the majority of the work is in-kind replacement or replacement with historically accurate materials. The work also qualifies for tax credits as described in Section 20.112 of the County Code.

Staff has requested additional information and spec sheets regarding the replacement windows. However, with the exception of the front windows on the 1st floor porch and two windows on the west side of the building, the other windows appear to all be modern. The replacement of all of the modern windows would qualify for the tax credit and will comply with the Secretary of the Interior Standards as historically appropriate materials are being put back in place. Staff recommends against tax credit pre-approval for the front porch windows and two side windows, which are in good condition. One of the porch windows has broken glass, but that is repairable (and the repair is eligible for the tax credit). However, the size and profile of those windows is unique and will not be easy to reproduce. Preserving the windows would comply with Standard 2, “The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alterations of features, spaces...shall be avoided.”

Items 1-8 are routine maintenance are eligible for tax credits per Section 20.112 of the County Code.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends:

- 1) Tax credit pre-approval for Items 1-8 for the historic part of the house only, excluding all outbuildings, site landscaping, the side addition and the rear porch, which are not historic.
- 2) For item 9, Staff recommends against tax credit pre-approval for the windows on the front porch, two original windows on the west side, the east side addition and two windows on the rear of the building on the first floor, which are modern. Otherwise, Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for all other windows.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Ethan Langrill and Steve Allnutt. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to staff comments. Mr. Langrill stated he had a new price sheet and breakdown for adding new exterior storm windows in lieu of replacing the existing windows. Mr. Allnutt stated that this was a very large scale project and the building is in complete disrepair. Mr. Hauser asked about the condition of the existing foundation. Mr. Langrill stated that the foundation was in good shape and there was no water in the crawl space.

Mr. Hauser asked about existing outbuildings on the property. Mr. Langrill explained that one is a gazebo with a hot tub. He stated that all the buildings would look the same with the white paint and white trim. He also stated the existing water feature would be kept.

Ms. Badart asked if the inside was repairable. Mr. Langrill stated that yes it is repairable and that the home at two layers of hard pine floors, which would be repaired. Mr. Hauser asked if any of the older windows would be changed. Mr. Langrill explained that no windows would be replaced but that he is adding exterior storm windows.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve as per staff recommendation #1, with the addition of tax credit approval for storm windows over the existing windows. Ms. Tennor seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-19 – 8202 Main Street, Ellicott City

Replace windows, tax credit pre-approval, Façade Improvement Program

Applicant: Ronald Peters

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1850. The Applicant proposes to replace the front windows on the 2nd, 3rd, 4th and 5th floor of the building, as well as the windows on the side and rear of the building. There are a total of 22 windows on the front of the building to be replaced, 5 on the side and 17 on the rear for a total of 44 windows. The existing windows are all wood and appear to be original to the building, with weighted pulleys that operate the windows. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement funds for the work. The Applicant has indicated the reasons for replacing the windows are:

- 1) The windows swell up in the summer and are hard to open. If there was a fire it would difficult for a tenant to open them to escape.
- 2) The windows are single pane glass. They are not energy efficient and allow a lot of street noise from traffic and bars closing at night.
- 3) The windows also allow more cold air in than an energy efficient double pane glass would and the replacement would help tenants heating and air conditioning bills.

Staff Comments: The windows were refinished in the 1990s and are in good condition. Staff understands the issues with street noise and energy efficiency, but does not want to see original windows in good condition removed from the building. Chapter 6.H (page 40) of the Guidelines recommends, “maintain and repair original windows openings, frames, sashes, sills, lintels and trim. Maintain glass, putty and paint in good condition. Install weatherstripping to reduce air infiltration.” The

Guidelines (page 41) recommend against “replacing sound wood windows and frames, even if paint, putty and glazing need repair or replacement.” The safety concern for the windows swelling in the summer is an important concern. Staff would have no objection to replacing the windows that provide emergency egress with wood windows to match the existing.

The side and the rear windows are also original the building and in good condition. Some of the rear windows do have some large gaps. If those gaps are unable to be repaired, Staff has no objection to the replacement with wood windows to match. Otherwise Staff recommends the Applicant install exterior storm windows, which would aid in energy efficiency and noise reduction, as well as protect the windows from the weather.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of replacing the windows required for emergency egress and tax credit pre-approval for the work Staff recommends Approval of replacement windows for any windows with gaps that are unable to be repaired and tax credit for the work. For all other windows, Staff recommends the windows be retained and recommends Approval of storm windows and tax credit pre-approval, contingent upon Staff approval of the final product to be selected.

Façade Improvement Program Recommendation: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds and receipt of two quotes for the work. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: Ms. Holmes explained that the Applicant has changed the application to pre-application advice. Mr. Hauser swore in Ronald Peters. Mr. Hauser asked how applicant would like to move forward. Mr. Peters explained that he originally wanted to replace windows with wooden sashes, however after meeting with Staff, he is looking into storm windows. He stated he was not in favor of adding storm windows on the outside as he does not want to detract from the historic façade. He explained access and maintenance would be easier if the storm windows were on the inside.

Ms. Tennor asked Mr. Taylor about tax credits for inside storm windows. Mr. Taylor asked what benefit is interior storm windows. Mr. Peters stated windows add insulation and cut down on heating costs, plus reduce sound for tenants

Mr. Hauser stated if the applicant could document all labor and materials for window repairs that he could get tax credits for keeping existing windows. Mr. Peters stated that he could install exterior storm windows on back of building. Mr. Hauser stated he would prefer exterior storm windows as much as possible to preserve historic windows.

Mr. Hauser stated that the applicant could research different avenues of restoration of the existing windows. Mr. Peters stated that the windows would be removed, repaired, repainted, then would be put back in original place.

Mr. Hauser asked about sealing existing stone work. Mr. Peters stated that he is looking into different avenues to repair or seal the existing stone work.

14-13 – 8312 Main Street (Parking Lot E), Ellicott City – continued from March

Landscape plan.

Applicant: Mark Richmond, Howard County Bureau of Environmental Services, Public Works

Background & Scope of Work: This application is being continued from the March 2014 meeting. In February 2014 the Applicant was approved to make alterations to Parking Lot E, including removing trees, installing bio retention facilities and constructing a staircase. The Applicant now seeks approval for the revised landscape planting plan.

Staff Comments: At the end of the March 2014 meeting, the Commission requested Staff and the Applicant meet with the residents who testified against the project to find a solution to the removal of the white pines. Staff and the Applicant met with the residents on March 14 and went over several alternative plans drawn up by the Applicant. The various versions of the plan included planting American Holly or Junipers on the County land and a combination of planting on the county land and adding two trees to the resident's front yard to block out the areas that are off limit for planting because of the bio-retention underground utility. The resident's did not want any trees planted on their property, so an alternative solution was agreed upon. The solution was to remove an unhealthy deciduous tree from below the power lines on the neighboring property and plant a new evergreen tree that would not grow beyond the height of the powerlines. This tree would then screen the view of the side of the parking lot closest to Ellicott Mills Brewery.

Staff finds the revised plans will better comply with the Guidelines in terms of removing and replacing mature trees. Staff has no objection to the removal of the tree on the resident's neighbor's property as it appears to be in poor condition and a hazard underneath the power lines. The replacement tree of a smaller evergreen like Arborvitae is more compatible with the site and will still buffer the view of the parking lot.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of the overall revised drawings, which includes American Holly evergreens where the current pines are, Arborvitae for the neighboring property and the Ellicott Mills Brewery backdoor, a larger caliper Red maple in the parking lot and more evergreen shrubs throughout the site. Staff also recommends Approval to remove and replace the neighboring tree.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Mark Richmond and Kyle Mundy of McCormick & Taylor.

Mr. Hauser asked the Applicants what had happened since the last meeting. Mr. Richmond explained they (Mr. Richmond, Ms. Mundy, Ms. Burgess and Ms. Holmes) met with the adjacent neighbor to discuss planting solutions and to come to an agreement for screening the parking lot. Mr. Richmond said they explained why the bio-retention facility could not be moved and presented several options for screening the neighbors view. After a discussion, they came up with a planting solution that everyone seemed happy and in agreement with.

Mr. Hauser swore in David Barber. Mr. Barber stated that when everyone met, they discussed trees, availability of trees and that he would like to see an assessment of trees. From him and his wife's end, they were trying to locate some trees and he was working with a landscaper.

Ms. Mundy explained the proposal to place four American Hollies within the bio-entention area, three along the north wall of the pond and one closer to the southeast wall to buffer the neighbor's view of Parking Lot E and then add an additional holly on the upper eastern side of the bio-retention area to buffer east of lot. Mr. Hauser asked how many total hollies and Ms. Mundy responded there would be five hollies. Mr. Hauser asked what other deciduous trees were in the planting. Ms. Mundy said they are adding a large red maple to be planted at parking lot surface grade and to replace the existing

hydrangea shrubs with three evergreen Arborvitae trees. Mr. Barber said they were not clear about the placement of western most trees, which were close to the flume area of the bio-retention facility. He asked if they were able to put the tree where discussed. Ms. Mundy replied the tree was added as discussed at the March 6 meeting and she indicated on the plan where the tree line previously stopped.

Mr. Hauser asked about the neighboring tree in bad condition that will be removed. Ms. Mundy said it's not on the plan, but indicated the direction of the tree. Ms. Burgess said that tree will be replaced with an arborvitae and that they are open to other trees, but its mature height can't exceed the height of the powerlines. Ms. Burgess said they will bring that tree removal back in a separate application if needed because it is not part of this scope of work.

Mr. Barber asked what caliper and height of tree would be planted. Ms. Mundy stated that as they discussed, based on size of root ball that can be carried manually, it would be 3-3.5 inch caliper and height, which would be between 12 and 14 feet tall. Ms. Badart asked about the speed of growth. Ms. Mundy said it's an evergreen so it will grow faster than a deciduous tree. Mr. Barber asked what they are estimating the root ball to weigh and asked if it was hand carry vs. a bobcat. Ms. Mundy said a 3 inch caliper is around 300 pounds and a 3.5 inch caliper could be up to 1,000 pounds. As mentioned at the March 6 meeting, Ms. Burgess explained that any tree planted needs to be carried by hand in order to avoid any equipment in the bio-retention area for damage, grading or compaction purposes and size of root ball is a factor.

Ms. Tennor was really impressed and pleased all parties and Staff were able to facilitate this collaboration and come to decisions and a resolution. Mr. Hauser asked if the red buds and crape myrtles were native plants and to what state. Ms. Mundy said the trees were native and that the red buds were native to Maryland and the others native to the east coast. Mr. Hauser asked discussed the growth of the plants on the site. Ms. Mundy said there are some issues with planting trees on the slope because a large rootball cannot be properly planted when it is so steep and then the trees are susceptible to fall over. Ms. Mundy explained and showed on the plan which trees are for winter visual interest to keep the area attractive during the winter.

Mr. Hauser asked Mr. Barber if they had reached a compromise. Mr. Barber said that he didn't know what else they could do hand carrying trees in there and that they were hoping to see twenty foot tall trees, and that he would like to stress getting the tallest tree possible be planted in order to get as much coverage as possible, like they had with the white pines. Mr. Hauser said they may have to see the project through first to get an idea what the coverage will be and that they may not see the results the first year. Mr. Barber said that 14 feet from the street would be great, but from their porch it won't do much to buffer the parking. He asked how much the hollies will grow each year. Ms. Burgess said they will grow about 8 inches a year. Ms. Burgess said the County is still willing to revisit the Barber's property if they want trees planted on their property. She said that she realizes at this time they are not interested in adding any trees to their property, but that they might decide another tree would help the buffer. Mr. Hauser said that he was thinking the same thing and that the project could be revisited next spring to see if any additional plantings can be made to Mr. Barber's property. Mr. Barber said they do not have any trees in their yard and that they don't want to put anything now as they don't have a landscape plan for that area, but that they could look at adding trees after the project is done.

Mr. Barber asked if the County has a source that will provide 3-4 inch caliper hollies. He wanted to know if he could find something with more height if could he could pass that information along. Mr. Richmond said that would be fine if it was still 3-4 guys with a wheelbarrow bringing the trees into the site and not machinery.

Motion: Ms. Tennor motioned to approve application per the Staff recommendations and include that

after the property has been re-planted and the project has gone forward that the County will work with the neighbor to see if there is any modest changes that can be done to ameliorate that view for them, either on the site or on the ground, within reason. The largest plant material that can be located and reasonably handle without damage to the site should be used.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Mr. Hauser moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Badart seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 8:33 p.m.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Joseph Hauser, Chairperson

Lisa Kenney, Recording Secretary



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ELLCOTT CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov
410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-1655
TDD 410-313-2323

May Minutes

The fourth regular meeting for the year 2014 of the Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, May 1, 2014 in the C. Vernon Gray Room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, Maryland.

Members present: Lisa Badart; Eileen Tennor; and Allan Shad

Members absent: Joseph Hauser; Sam Crozier; and Dan Bennett

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Lewis Taylor, and Carol Stirn

Chairperson Lisa Badart opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules of the meeting. Ms. Tennor moved to Approve the April 3, 2014 minutes. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. 14-20 – 8469 Main Street, Ellicott City
2. 14-21 – 8069 Main Street, Ellicott City
3. 14-22 – 8390 Main Street, 8308 Main Street, 8069 Main Street, 8059 Main Street, 2711 Maryland Avenue, 3723 Old Columbia Pike,
4. 14-23 – 8390 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-984
5. 14-24 – 8014, 8016-8018 Main Street, Ellicott City
6. 14-15 – 6375 Ten Oaks Road, Clarksville
7. 14-25 – Benjamin Moore ‘Paint What Matters’ – Main Street, from the railroad bridge to Old Columbia Pike

CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Holmes stated that both applications on the consent agenda, 14-20 and 14-21, and the Staff reports, will be incorporated into the record by reference.

14-20 – 8469 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Margaret Andrews

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1920. The Applicant proposes to the paint the exterior of the house in-kind to match the existing paint colors. The Applicant also proposes to replace the existing metal gutters in-kind to match the existing. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Staff Comments: The painting and replacement of the gutters is considered Routine Maintenance as defined in Chapter 5, “painting previously painted surfaces using the same color” and “repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding...and other appurtenant fixtures using the same materials and design.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Shad moved to Approve the application as submitted. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-21 – 8069 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Len Berkowitz

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to paint the front, sides and rear of the building a new color, as part of the Benjamin Moore ‘Paint What Matters’ contest. The exterior walls of the building will be painted Geddy Gray and the doors Prussian Blue. The front of the building will be painted as part of the Benjamin Moore project, but the Applicant will paint the sides and rear himself. Damaged stucco and other exterior materials, such as wood, will be repaired as needed. The Applicant also seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6.N recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings...In general use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Shad moved to Approve the application as submitted. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

14-22 – 8390 Main Street, 8307 Main Street, 8069 Tiber Alley, 8059 Main Street, 2711 Maryland Avenue, 3723 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City

Install rain barrels.

Applicant: Lori Lilly

Background & Scope of Work: The Applicant proposes to install whiskey style rain barrels at 8390 Main Street, 8308 Main Street, 8069 Main Street, 8059 Main Street, 2711 Maryland Avenue and 3723 Old Columbia Pike. These are the same style of whiskey barrels approved in a previous application.

Staff Comments: The attachments for the rain barrels will need to be customized for each building, as each building may have a different style of downspout. In general, Staff’s main concerns are the rain barrels being placed within walkways, as Ellicott City already has narrow sidewalks and right-of-ways.

Staff is concerned about rain barrels being placed at buildings, but not being used. That creates a potential for stagnant water.

8390 Main Street (The Wine Bin)

This location would be a good fit for the program. The area by the downspout does not impede pedestrian traffic and is close to large container pots that are regularly planted. If the rain barrel needs to be elevated, Staff would recommend using paver stones, or something similar that is attractive and has finished sides, over a material such as concrete block.

8307 Main Street (Hire Power)

There are two garden beds across a corner of the parking lot from the potential rain barrel site. The site is behind the building in Parking Lot D, but not in a highly pedestrian trafficked area. This site is a good choice for a rain barrel if the water is utilized for neighboring gardens.

8069 Tiber Alley (Rumor Mill Restaurant)

There does not appear to be any flower pots or garden beds in this area. If the restaurant was interested in adding and maintaining flower pots, then a rain barrel would be appropriate at this site.

8059 Main Street (behind Bean Hollow)

This location does border a garden area and would not block pedestrian traffic. A long secured soaker hose would be needed to slowly distribute water from the barrel.

2711 Maryland Avenue (B&O Museum)

This location also has the potential to hold a rain barrel. There is a small garden bed near the main entrance to the B&O Museum, so the rain barrel would need a hose that could reach that area. Otherwise there are no garden beds or flower pots next to the location of the downspout.

3723 Old Columbia Pike (behind Envy Salon)

This rain barrel location is behind the building. There is a rear yard, so the rain barrel would be used.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted for all locations.

Testimony: Ms. Burgess stated Lori Lilly could not make the meeting, but would go along with the decision of the Commission. Ms. Tennor wanted to emphasize that the Applicants need to pay attention to the water levels in the barrel and the barrels need to be monitored. She said that the water level cannot stay too low as this will contribute to the deterioration of the barrel. Ms. Badart stated this is a high maintenance and involved project and that she is reluctant to make a decision without knowing if the owners are willing to take care of the rain barrel. Ms. Burgess said that the Green Committee would take ownership for a year in order to make this successful. The Green Committee is also willing to do maintenance. Ms. Badart asked the Commission if this case would be worth continuing for another month, or does the project make sense. Mr. Shad stated it makes sense. The Green Committee is going to take ownership and work with the owners and do periodic checks. Ms. Tennor emphasized any owner needs to make sure they keep involved and not just forget it.

Ms. Badart swore in Sherry Fackler-Berkowitz. Ms. Fackler-Berkowitz had concerns about another item being placed in the alleys as there are already so many trash cans, recycle bins and other items. Ms. Fackler-Berkowitz asked why wood barrels are still used to hold water; could a green liner be placed inside the wood barrel for the water. Ms. Tennor stated a liner should never be placed inside a wood barrel because the barrel would fall apart. The barrel needs water in it to make the wood expand against the rings and makes them water tight. If the barrel stays empty in the elements, the wood will shrink and fall apart. Ms. Fackler-Berkowitz commented that there are so many items in the alley; and that the alley is not being maintained. Ms. Burgess stated due to the streetscape grant received from

the State, the County will be looking at ways to start cleaning up the alleys and reducing some of the items and working on beautifying the area. Ms. Fackler-Berkowitz stated that even though there are recycle bins available, no one is using them. There are many black bags sitting in the alleys full of trash and recyclable items. Ms. Fackler-Berkowitz reiterated her biggest concern is adding another large item to the alley.

Ms. Badart asked if the rain barrels are going to be a permanent, ongoing program or a designated timeframe. Ms. Burgess stated the rain barrels will be staying, but if an issue arises the rain barrel could be removed. Ms. Badart asked when the rain barrels would be installed. Ms. Burgess stated the rain barrels would go in once given approval. If approval is not given, the rain barrels could go to residents, which would not need approval.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to Approve the application as submitted with the provision that the maintenance of the barrels be under the guidance of the Ellicott City Historic District Partnership, and that the Partnership will supervise the locations for functionality and insect control. A report on the rain barrels is to be submitted to Staff at 12 months. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-23 – 8390 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-984

Install awning.

Applicant: David Carney

Background & Scope of Work: According to the Historic Sites Inventory form the building dates to 1938-1939. The Applicant proposes to install an awning on the first floor storefront of the building. The awning will be a shed style awning made of black Sunbrella acrylic fabric and read, “The Wine Bin” across the front. Due to the nature of the business as wine store, the Applicant needs the awning to block out the sun rays that are hitting the wine inside the store. The Applicant has previously applied temporary tints to the windows, but it was not effective and the tint from the outside has made it dark to see inside, causing customers think the store is closed, thus hurting business.

The Applicant seeks Façade Improvement Program funds for the work.

Staff Comments: The Application complies with Chapter 6.L (page 48) recommendations, “when installing awnings or canopies, use shed-style awnings that are scaled appropriately for the building size and window spacing. Awnings should be made of non-reflective canvas or another strong fabric, in a color compatible with the building façade.” Staff recognizes that the Commission has found that awnings are not always appropriate for every building on Main Street. While historically an awning would not have existed on this building since it was a firehouse, the awning is only being requested to block the sun, which is damaging the wine the store sells. Staff has no objection to the installation of the awning as it is not a permanent change to the building and can be removed if the business was to ever leave the space. Adding the business name across the awning will also ensure that any future business would not leave the awning up.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted, with the ‘The Wine Bin’ written on the awning’s valance.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval

have been received.

Testimony: Ms. Badart swore in David Carney. Ms. Badart asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Carney explained that he has tried different ideas (tinting, roll down window shades) to help block the sun and now wishes to try the awning. He said it's mainly a problem about 6 months out of the year when the sun comes directly in and he has to keep moving wine around. Mr. Carney does not want to have to completely block the window with signs or other items so the product would not be seen from the outside. Ms. Badart confirmed that the color of the awning is black. Mr. Carney stated it is black and the valance would be straight with no scalloping. Ms. Tennor went on record being against the proliferation of awnings in Historic Ellicott City and explained there are too many awnings. Mr. Carney said he likes the look of awnings and finds there are too many business owners who do not maintain their awnings, but that he maintains the appearance of his store. Ms. Tennor said that she understands awning is for functionality and not advertising. Mr. Carney stated correct. Ms. Tennor said that she thinks the next tenant of the property could just change the sign on the valance of the awning.

Mr. Shad had no comments. Ms. Badart is in agreement with Ms. Tennor, but understands the wine must be preserved. Ms. Badart asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak on the application.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve as per Staff recommendations. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-24 – 8014, 8016-8018 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations to storefront.

Applicant: Loretta Moran and Mike Pascale

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the buildings dates to 1890. This application consists of two property addresses, owned by two separate entities. However, the buildings share a cohesive storefront design and must be looked at as one overall design. The Applicants propose to remove the cedar shake wall that is around the entry wall in order to open up the storefront. There is also cedar shake inside the storefront entryway that will be removed and wainscoting will be added in its place. The Applicants also propose to replace the existing mailboxes, but have not yet picked out a new product. The existing mailboxes will be highly visible once the cedar is removed.

8016-8018 Main Street

The storefront window at 8018 Main Street will have wood trim added to match the neighboring storefront at 8014, without replacing the storefront glass. The sides of the storefront window near the roofline will have wainscoting installed to match the neighboring building.

8014 Main Street

The Applicant proposes to cover an existing door, which is no longer functional, with wainscoting. Currently, each building has two doors.

Staff Comments: The application generally complies with Chapter 6.K (page47) recommendations, "uncover or replace architectural detailing that has been obscured by later additions," and "where physical, photographic or other documentation exists for an earlier storefront, or for the building's appearance before a storefront was added, restore the earlier storefront design if the later renovations has not acquired historic significance of its own. Remove non-historic fronts, panels, cornices and pent roofs."

8014 Main Street

Staff recommends against removing and covering the existing door with wainscoting. While the buildings are legally two separate buildings, they read as a duplex unit, sharing a storefront. Right now each storefront has two doors, one that leads into the 1st floor retail space and another leading to the residential units above. While the existing door may no longer be functional, Staff finds it more appropriate to block off the door from the inside, but replace the door to match the neighboring at 8016-8018. Chapter 6.G (page 38) of the Guidelines recommend against, “changing the size of door openings; blocking or filling door openings, transoms or sidelights.” The existing door that no longer functions does not comply with the Guidelines (page 38), which recommend against, “using flush doors without trim or panels.” Replacing the door to match the neighboring door would be most appropriate and comply with Chapter 6.G recommendations, “replace inappropriate modern doors with doors of an appropriate style. If documentary evidence of the original door is available, choose a new door similar to the original. Otherwise, use a door appropriate to the period and style of the building.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends:

- 1) Approval of all changes to 8016-8018 Main Street.
- 2) Denial of covering the door with wainscoting on 8014 Main Street.
 - a. However, Staff would recommend Approval of replacing the door with a more appropriate door, subject to Staff Approval.
- 3) Approval of new mailboxes, subject to Staff approval if the Commission is agreeable.
- 4) Tax credit pre-approval for the storefront alterations and purchase/installation of a new door.

Testimony: The Applicants were not present. Ms. Holmes explained that she met with the Applicants and that it sounds like they are agreeable to replacing the door with a more appropriate door. Ms. Badart asked if this was the door with all the mailboxes. Ms. Holmes said that it is the door next to it. Ms. Holmes showed the Commission some pictures of the storefront and doors and explained the changes regarding painting and alterations. The building is also getting painted by Benjamin Moore so the changes need to be completed before the painting begins. Ms. Bardart asked if the plan was to keep the mailboxes in the same spot. Ms. Holmes said she didn’t know, but that new boxes could look good centered on the protrusion. Ms. Tennor asked if it will all be painted white. Ms. Holmes said that the wood and brick will all be painted white and the doors will have color. Mr. Shad asked if the Applicants agreed with the Staff recommendations. Ms. Holmes said that she thought they were going to be at the meeting, but that she’s explained how the guidelines work and that they don’t recommend closing in the door and that Staff couldn’t recommend closing the in. Ms. Holmes read an email from the applicant for 8014 that said they would like to do something to make it look better, which may be matching doors.

Motion: Mr. Shad moved to Approve per Staff recommendations. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-15 – 6375 Ten Oaks Road, Clarksville

Advisory Comments for demolition

Applicant: Brian Dolan

Background & Scope of Work: According to the County architectural historian, the building dates to 1875. The Applicant proposes to demolish the existing historic house and approximately 1950s era outbuilding. The Applicant does not have any set plans for the land after the demolition of the house.

Staff Comments: The house was originally constructed by William Dorsey. This is the last historic house in the vicinity; a colonial revival once neighbored this building, but has been torn down in recent years.

This building is habitable and could be moved to a new location. Staff would like to see an attempt to

preserve this building, possibly by offering the building for free to a new owner to relocate. Staff would prefer the building not be demolished, especially until the future plans have been further developed. However, if after a good faith effort to locate a new owner, Staff would like to see the building deconstructed and the materials donated to a salvage company such as Habitat for Humanity Restore, the Loading Dock or Second Chance.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the building be offered free to any interested parties for relocation and then otherwise deconstructed with the building materials donated.

Testimony: Ms. Badart swore in Brian Dolan and Hillel Traub. Ms. Badart asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Dolan stated no changes, but wanted to give a bit of history of the site. Development of the site began 4 to 5 years ago on an approved site plan for a shopping area. The project was halted due to economic conditions. The development process was restarted about 8 months ago. The engineer on the project is Rob Vogel. A site plan would be developed and submitted within 60 to 90 days. A request to raze the building had been started a couple of months ago, until Mr. Dolan was made aware of the full process. After reviewing the Staff's comments from the previous meeting, it was realized that the building could not be taken down without dealing with reconstruction. A contractor was asked about moving the building; the contractor stated no, the building would fall down. Another inquiry also confirmed the building could not be moved, but could be deconstructed. An appraiser looked at the building and also confirmed it could be deconstructed. Mr. Dolan stated the commitment is to do the deconstruction. The materials will be given to The Loading Dock. Mr. Dolan made a request to the Commission to move forward with the deconstruction.

Ms. Badart swore in Steve Verill. Mr. Verill has been working with deconstruction for 18 years. The building at Ten Oaks cannot be moved. The building does not have mortise and tenon corners. The building is tall and electrical lines would have to be moved. Regarding the deconstruction, there will be about an 85% reclaim. The house is no longer considered a house; it was modified to be a beauty salon and some office space. In reviewing the house, the building is mostly made of Douglas Fir; the basement has some logs of Red Oak. These logs would go to The Loading Dock, who will contact several furniture stores and cabinet makers. To restore the house to its original form, the old drawings would be needed, but it would be difficult to know exactly where every item used to be. Deconstructing the building would be the best way to go as a majority of the building will be reused. The only items that are thrown out are the insulation and plaster. Ms. Badart asked about the inside of the building. Mr. Verill stated there are several rooms which look like office space, several hair salon sinks mounted into the wall, and one small bathroom. After the linoleum and plywood which was installed over the original flooring is removed, the wood can be taken up, cleaned up and run through a planer. Ms. Badart asked about any original mantel pieces or moulding to note. Mr. Verill stated there is nothing original left; the historical items were removed when the remodeling was done. The metal roof will be removed and recycled by The Loading Dock. Mr. Verill stated the art students from Mount Royal will come down and sometimes purchase usable items which can be used for their art projects. Ms. Tennor asked about the timeframe for the project. Mr. Verill stated once a permit is issued it usually takes 8 to 9 days, or longer if there are any weather problems.

Mr. Shad has no comments, except it is sad to see the last historic house in Clarksville removed.

Ms. Tennor would have liked to see the house saved or moved.

Ms. Badart stated if the house cannot be saved or moved, then it would be best to salvage the materials. This would be the recommendation of the Commission to go forward with the deconstruction.

14-25 – All addresses on Main Street - 8004-8006, 8014, 8016-8018, 8020-8022, 8024-8026, 8030-8036, 8044, 8048, 8049, 8050, 8052, 8054, 8055, 8056, 8060, 8059-8061, 8066, 8069, 8070, 8074, 8076, 8080-8082, 8081, 8085-8089, 8086, 8090, 8095, 8098, 8102-8104, 8109-8111, 8113, 8116, 8120, 8125, 8128,

8129, 8130, 8132, 8133, 8134, 8141, 8167, 8173, 8180, 8181, 8186, 8185-8187, 8191, 8198, 8202 Main Street; CSX Railroad Bridge, B&O Railroad Car at Maryland Avenue and St. Paul Street

Paint exteriors, minor repairs as part of Benjamin Moore, Paint What Matters

Applicant: Jake Herron, representative from Benjamin More

Background & Scope of Work: Ellicott City was recently chosen to be part of the Benjamin Moore contest, Paint What Matters. As a result of being chosen in this contest, the majority of the buildings along Main Street from the railroad bridge to approximately Old Columbia Pike will be painted. The County has been working with Benjamin Moore to establish a time frame for this project, as well coordinate any work that must be done ahead of time, such as having the Historic District Commission approve paint colors.

The County was given a paint palette that Benjamin Moore picked out for Ellicott City, which the Commission reviewed a few months ago. In the applications, each building has a specific color palette picked out. New colors schemes are proposed for the following address: 8102-8104, 8109-8111, 8113, 8133, 8014-8018, 8020-8026, 8125, 8069, 8085, 8030-8034, 8080-8082, 8004, 8052, 8050, 8055, 8048, 8044, 8056, 8116, 8141, and 8128-8134. Some of the color changes are very minor changes, such as a new door or shutter color, whereas others are total overalls of the current paint scheme. The other buildings will receive a color match as closely as possible to the existing color. Not all buildings between Old Columbia Pike and the bridge were in the scope of work for Benjamin Moore.

The CSX Bridge containing the Ellicott City sign and the historic railroad car will also be painted in-kind to match the existing.

Staff Comments: The paint colors generally comply with Chapter 6.N recommendations (page 50), “use colors appropriate to the period and style of the building” and “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinate color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The color choices take into account that the Guidelines recommend against, “using primary colors, bright orange, bright purple and grass green. These are not historically appropriate and generally will not blend with the district’s architecture,” and also recommend against, “using too many colors. This may detract from the architectural design of the building.”

Staff has reviewed the color palettes chosen for each building and does not see any issues with the colors selected. Some of the colors have been added since the Commission originally saw the palette, in order to add some more color options into the scheme. Some of these colors, one of which is a deep purple, will be reserved for small details such as doors, and trim, in-keeping with the Guidelines. This is a large scale project and there may be some unexpected issues that could arise during the painting process. Some buildings that are not currently included in the scope of work (but within the project boundary) were included in the legal advertisement and this staff report in the event that property owners opted out of this contest and funds became available to paint additional buildings. Due to the unknowns in this project, Staff would like to request the Commission give Staff permission to approve any changes that may arise for all buildings within the scope of work from the railroad bridge to Old Columbia Pike.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the paint palette for each building as referenced in the applications and requests the Commission give Staff permission to approve any changes that may arise during painting process, contingent upon the colors being appropriate for the historic district.

Testimony: Ms. Badart swore in Jake Herron and Haley Woods. The Staff and Commission discussed the different buildings types and paint colors chosen. Ms. Tennor does not have any problem with black

shutters, but found that black window frames on granite would be too dark. Staff showed each picture to the Commission, including in-kind colors, to show the total scope of work. Ms. Woods held up large swatches of the building colors for the Commission to see as each picture was shown. Ms. Badart asked if the colors were proposed by Benjamin Moore. Ms. Wood stated the Benjamin Moore color team did proposals and took into account buildings with more than one floor and the historic nature of the area. The idea was to present the opportunity for first floor exterior façade work. The team did not try to influence negative or positive of a building; additional floors do not have to be done. Ms. Tennor asked to clarify that only the street level will be painted, not the upper stories. Ms. Holmes stated that was correct. Ms. Tennor asked Ms. Woods if the owners want to do the upper stories do they coordinate with her. Ms. Wood stated yes. If the owner would like to do additional work on the upper stories, a discount on the paint and on the services will be given, and the work will be done at the same time. The opportunity will be presented to the owner, but not forced on them.

Before the Commission votes, Ms. Holmes asked, if the Commission is agreeable, that Staff would like to request to give the approval for any changes that arise, staying within all the colors which have been presented.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve the colors as noted and shown by Staff, with the stipulation that any changes in the color schemes have Staff approval within the approved color palette. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Tennor moved to excuse Sam Crozier's absence due to his illness and being hospitalized. Ms. Badart seconded. The Commission approved unanimously.

Ms. Badart moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Tennor seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 9:02 p.m.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Lisa Badart, Chairperson

Carol Stirn, Recording Secretary



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ELlicott City Historic District ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov
410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-1655
TDD 410-313-2323

June Minutes

The fifth regular meeting for the year 2014 of the Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, June 5, 2014 in the C. Vernon Gray Room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, Maryland.

Members present: Joseph Hauser, Chairperson; Lisa Badart; Eileen Tennor; and Allan Shad

Members absent: Sam Crozier

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Lewis Taylor, Dan Bennett, and Carol Stirn

Chairperson Joseph Hauser opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules of the meeting. Mr. Shad moved to Approve the May 1, 2014 minutes. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. 14-26 – 3711 Maryland Avenue, Ellicott City, HO-71
2. 14-27 – 6090 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge, HO-381
3. 14-28 – 3723 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City, HO-313
4. 14-29 – 3630 Church Road, Ellicott City
5. 14-30 – 4844 Bonnie Branch Road, Ellicott City, HO-861
6. 14-31 – 8358 Main Street, Ellicott City
7. 14-32 – 3776 Church Road, Ellicott City
8. 14-33 – 6680 Martin Road, Columbia, HO-37
9. 14-34 – 8391 Main Street, Ellicott City
10. 14-35 – 8312 Main Street, Ellicott City (Parking Lot E)
11. 14-36 – 8374 Court Avenue, Ellicott City
12. 14-37 – 8205 College Avenue, Ellicott City
13. 14-38 – 3592 Fels Lane, Ellicott City

CONSENT AGENDA

14-26 – 3711 Maryland Avenue, Ellicott City, HO-71

Install plaque.

Applicant: Travis Harry

Background & Scope of Work: According to the Historic Sites Inventory form the building dates to 1829-1830. The Applicant proposes to install a freestanding bronze plaque, mounted on a post. The plaque will be 18 inches high by 18 inches wide, for a total of 3 square feet. The plaque will be mounted on a 6 foot long square post, installed 3 feet into the ground. The plaque will stand waist level, about 3 feet high, after installation. The color and material of the plaque will be dark oxide bronze.

The plaque is a commemorative plaque in honor of the Union troops who fought during the Civil War and consists of 15 lines of text. The plaque will be installed on the street side of the garden in front of the B&O station, between the two benches.

Staff Comments: The application is consistent with Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommendations, “use simple, legible words and graphics” and “use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three.” The plaque will only be one color, dark oxide bronze. The plaque will also be bronze which complies with Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommendations, “use historically appropriate materials such as wood or iron for signs and supporting hardware.” The plaque will be freestanding and complies with the guidelines set for in Chapter 11.B (page 84), “to respect the pedestrian scale, limit the size of a freestanding sign to four to six square feet in area.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-27 – 6090 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge, HO-381

Remove tree.

Applicant: Elkridge Assembly Rooms

Background & Scope of Work: According to the Historic Sites Inventory form the building dates to 1871. The Applicant proposes to cut down one dead oak tree near the corner of Lawyers Hill Road and Old Lawyers Hill Road.

Staff Comments: According to Chapter 9.B.4, “removing dead or diseased vegetation” is considered Routine Maintenance.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted for the removal of the dead tree.

Testimony: Ms. Badart recused herself from 14-27 – 6090 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge, HO-381. There was no other testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-28 – 3723 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City, HO-313

Exterior repairs. Façade Improvement funds, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: David Ennis

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1820. The Applicant proposes to re-set and stabilize the existing granite steps. The work will also include the repair and repointing of the garden wall, with the mortar to match as close as possible. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement funds for the work.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6.C (page 26) recommendations, “maintain or restore granite buildings, foundations, steps, lintels, sills, fence posts and retaining walls” and “repair

rather than replace masonry walls, through repointing and limited replacement of masonry with units that match the size, color and texture of damaged or missing unit.”

This setting is unique for a commercial building in Ellicott City, as the garden wall supports the land the foundation of the building is sitting on. Independent retaining walls would not typically be eligible for the tax credit as they are not part of the historic structure, although this wall is part of the front steps for this building. The second set of steps is part of the structure. Staff has no objection for issuing tax credits for the entire scope of work, as the wall supports the building. The first set of steps also directly ties into the second set, which are connected to the building.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds and receipt of two quotes for the work. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-29 – 3630 Church Road, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Gary Segal

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1937. The Applicant proposes to repair damaged portions of the slate roof and chimney flashing using in-kind materials, to match the existing. The Applicant also proposes to paint the exterior of the house white, to match the existing color.

Staff Comments: The repair of the slate roof is considered routine maintenance as explained in Chapter 6.E, “repairing roofs, including the replacement of small areas of roofing material, using material similar to the existing roofing in dimensions, shape color and texture.” Chapter 5 (page 23) also defines routine maintenance as “repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding, external doors and windows, trim, lights and other appurtenant fixtures using the same materials and design.”

The painting of the exterior of the house to match the color is also considered routine maintenance as defined in Chapter 5, “painting previously painted surfaces using the same color.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-30 – 4844 Bonnie Branch Road, Ellicott City, HO-861

Exterior repairs. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Donald L Startzell

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1953. This house is not located in a local historic district, but is listed in the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-861, the Melton House. This house is one of the few mid-20th century international Style houses in Howard County. The Applicant proposes to stain the exterior of the house, to include all cedar siding and decks. The wood will be cleaned and then re-stained to match the existing color. Any holes in the cedar will be filled in with fiberglass.

Staff Comments: The staining of the exterior wood complies with Secretary of the Interior Standard Number 5, “distinctive materials, features, finishes and construction techniques or examples of craftsmanship that characterize a property shall be preserved.” The work is eligible for tax credits as defined in Section 20.112 of the County Code

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-31 – 8358 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: Kathleen P. Taylor

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1930. The Applicant proposes to paint the building in-kind to match the existing and to replace the side porch roof. The porch roof is currently asphalt shingle and will be replaced with Certainteed XT 25 three tab shingles. The Applicant also proposes to replace the flashing and caulk around the chimneys.

Staff Comments: The replacement of the asphalt porch roof is considered routine maintenance as explained in Chapter 6.E, “repairing roofs, including the replacement of small areas of roofing material, using material similar to the existing roofing in dimensions, shape color and texture.” Chapter 5 (page 23) also defines routine maintenance as “repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding, external doors and windows, trim, lights and other appurtenant fixtures using the same materials and design.”

Painting the exterior of the house to match the existing color is also considered routine maintenance as defined in Chapter 5, “painting previously painted surfaces using the same color.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds and receipt of two quotes for the work. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-32 – 3776 Church Road, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: Emily Kowalski

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1980. The Applicant proposes to replace the existing 6 panel steel front door facing Church Road with a new door that will be a half lite, two panel flush with internal blinds. The new door will be steel painted white.

Staff Comments: The house is not historic, but the proposed door does comply with Chapter 8.B (page 58) recommendations for new construction, “use elements such as porch shapes, window or door openings...and other characteristics that echo historic Ellicott City buildings.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

14-33 – 6680 Martin Road, Columbia, HO-37

Advisory comments for subdivision without demolition.

Applicant: Legacy Investment, LLC, Michael Sponseller

Background & Scope of Work: According to the Historic Sites Inventory form, “The Georgian manor house known as Athol was originally built as the rectory for the Old Brick Church in Guidlford, which was established in 1728. Athol was constructed between 1732 and 1750 for James MacGill, the first episcopla minister to serve the church, on 600 acres of land granted by King Charles on August 17, 1732. In honor of his ancestral home in Scotland, MacGill patented the property under the name of ‘Athol’. The rectory, splendidly detailed and constructed of fine local materials including granite, oak, walnut and pine, reflected the importance of the position the church held within Colonial society and the craftsmanship of the immigrant Scottish masons who were responsible for the construction of the building. The property remained in the MacGill family until about the early part of the 19th century, when it was subsequently subdivided. The former rectory, retaining the name Athol, has been restored and stands as one of the oldest dwellings in Howard County.”

This house is not located in a local historic district, but is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory. The property consists of .96 acres. The Applicant proposes to subdivide off a portion of the property containing the historic house into the neighboring parcel, which will be developed with 11 lots. There will be 50 feet between the new development and the rear of the historic property. The driveway for the historic house will branch off of the new road, but otherwise remain the same. A group of trees along the driveway of the historic house will be removed. The barn will also be demolished as houses will be located at that site.

Staff Comments: The new development will encroach upon the setting of the historic house, not leaving an adequate setback for this home. If possible, Staff recommends Lots 7 and 8 could be relocated within the development where open space is denoted and the area at the end of the T drive would then become the recreation open space, a better open space for the community and provide more distance from the homes. If a reforestation or forest conservation area is able to be relocated at the end of the T drive, this would provide an adequate buffer for the historic property and the planned lots could be shifted north at minimal effort. Staff recommends planting a dense native evergreen buffer to shield the new development from view of the historic house. The buffer as shown with five trees is not adequate.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends switching Lot 8 with the designated recreational open space currently between Lot 10 & 11, shifting the property lot lines 20 feet north to allow a greater buffer from the homes or plant a dense, native evergreen buffer between the historic house and new development.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Chris Ogle of Benchmark Engineering and Michael Sponseller. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Ogle wanted to discuss the lot relocation. He said that the two lots in question are Lots 5 and 6. He explained that efforts have been made to relocate the lots further back from the historic house, but the north side of the property has a floodplain, forest conservation, stream and stream buffers. Mr. Ogle said that Howard County Regulations state that lots cannot contain any buffers or environmental features, so it would be a problem to relocate the lots back into the open space area. Mr. Hauser asked if one of the lots could be placed between Lots 10 and 11. Mr. Ogle stated no because it is too near the stream buffer and environmental features, plus there are steep slopes located in that area. This could also prevent the lot from making the minimum lot size.

Mr. Ogle said there is also a noise wall to prevent noise from Route 29, so the lot has been pushed away from Route 29. Mr. Hauser asked what the distance was from the sound barrier. Mr. Ogle said the State is building a noise wall onto Route 29 which will stop before the property and they are proposing a noise wall behind Lots 10 and 11.

Ms. Tennor made a suggestion to adjust the intersection of the new road and Martin Road to raise the curb up toward the floodplain so the top of the road aligns with the straight line of the floodplain. This may allow everything to be shifted farther with the majority of the floodplain being untouched. The change could allow an additional 20 to 25 feet between the new development and the existing property. Mr. Ogle commented the problem is that the floodplain is already close to where the disturbance is. Mr. Hauser suggested reconfiguring Lots 6 and 7 and using the forest conservation area behind Lot 7. The lots would be more elongated and face the historic structure. The homes would be backed away more from the historic structure. Mr. Ogle stated the forest area cannot be disturbed and reconfiguring could possibly become a pipestem driveway.

Ms. Tennor asked if there was any way to either modify or move up away from the historic structure the T-turnaround. She asked if the T could be brought into the roadway and not have so much paving near the historic structure. Mr. Sponseller stated the change might not meet the Fire Department turn around code. Mr. Ogle stated the idea to shift the T further back is not a bad idea, but bringing driveways off the edge of the T is not allowed. Ms. Tennor asked once the new paving is installed will the existing drive and everything else, except for the new connection to the existing drive, remain. Mr. Ogle stated yes. The only disturbance will be to remove the existing driveway which accesses the current driveway from Martin Road; this will be relocated into the public road. An access will come off the public road to access back to where the natural driveway is located.

Mr. Sponseller stated there has been no determination yet regarding the buffer planting, but the goal is to establish a forested buffer. Mr. Hauser asked the maximum density allowed on the parcel. Mr. Ogle

stated it is based on how much open space can be provided. R-12 zoning does not have density; it is based on the percentage of open space given and a certain amount of square footage for lots. Mr. Hauser asked if a larger lot size and higher quality houses has been considered. Mr. Sponseller stated after looking at comparable houses in the area and the price range, the proposed house sizes fit within the area. Mr. Hauser asked about the lot sizes. Mr. Ogle stated the lot size is just under 8,000 square feet. The minimum size is 7,200 square feet. Mr. Hauser asked if the square footage of the house was known. Mr. Ogle stated around 1,600 for the footprint. Mr. Sponseller commented this just applies to one floor and incorporates the garage as well. The idea is to have 2 to 2 ½ story homes.

Mr. Hauser stated he would like to see the Staff recommendations followed closely to make more room in order to save the value of the historic home. Ms. Tennor suggested as an alternative to a dense evergreen planting that an understory planting be placed under the canopy trees to look like it grew with the canopy trees.

Ms. Holmes asked if there was a known date for the age of the barn. Mr. Ogle stated only what was in the historic report. Ms. Holmes stated the architectural historian will take a look at the barn and document it if the barn looks old in any way.

14-34 – 8391 Main Street, Ellicott City

Construct shed.

Applicant: David Stratmann

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1920. The Applicant proposes to construct a shed behind the building. The shed will be constructed with wood siding to match the historic building and will have an asphalt roof. The siding will be painted yellow, the trim white and the door red. The shed will have a shed style roof, slanted toward the granite retaining wall.

Staff Comments: Staff is concerned that the slant of the shed style roof will be directing water toward the granite retaining walls foundation. As many granite walls in Ellicott City have collapsed in recent years, Staff would prefer to direct water away from the wall. Staff does not find the shed style roof to be the most appropriate for the historic district, as it will be visible from the street. Staff recommends using a front gable roof, which will direct water to the sides of the shed. The location of the shed complies with Chapter 7.C (page 55) recommendations, “if allowed by the size and shape of the property, place new outbuildings to the side or rear of the main building, separated from the main building by a substantial setback.” The space is limited, so there will not be a large setback, but the shed will be built at the back of the property. The materials also comply with Chapter 7.C (page 55) of the Guidelines, “use materials compatible with the main building on the lot or with historic outbuildings in the immediate neighborhood.” However, the style of the shed roof does not comply with the Guidelines, which recommend, “design outbuildings visible from a public way to be compatible in scale, form and detailing with historic structures and outbuildings in the neighborhood.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of the installation of a shed, but recommends using a front gable roof.

Testimony: The applicant was not present. Ms. Holmes stated that the Applicant emailed her and read his email, which stated that they would easily change the roof pitch. Ms. Tennor asked about the placement of the shed because the plot plan showed a different location than the photos. The Commission and Staff discussed to confirm the shed is placed where it should be.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve as per Staff recommendations. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-35 – 8312 Main Street, Ellicott City (Parking Lot E)

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: Mark Richmond, Howard County Department of Public Works

Background & Scope of Work: The Applicant was recently approved to make alterations to this parking lot. The Applicant now seeks approval to update the street lights and parking plan. The pedestrian style lighting will be a King Luminaire K611 and black 10 foot agility #2 pole. The existing streetlight arms will be replaced with the King Luminaire K902 and 16 foot Agility #2 pole. The K902 is designed for parking lot lighting and is an approved BGE fixture. All of the new lights will be LED, in accordance with Howard County's planned conversion to LED lights. The pedestrian style light fixtures are very similar to the existing pedestrian style fixtures in Ellicott City. A new pedestrian style pole will be added in the alley next to the brewery. There will be two pedestrian poles at the landing of the staircase. The large pole with the transformers near the future staircase landing will be removed. The three lighting arms extending from the large poles will be removed. Two new parking lot poles with the K902 fixture will be added to the parking lot, one on each end.

The parking layout has been revised to reflect changes made after a meeting with Howard County's traffic planners. The spaces will be 90 degree parking and there will be twenty seven total spaces in the lot.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 10 recommendations. The lighting fixtures comply with Chapter 10.D recommendations, "whenever possible, use a consistent design of light poles and fixtures within a given area of the historic district" and "when new streetlights or parking lot lights are needed, install traditional style, post-top fixtures made of dark metal or a material that resembles dark metal, particularly in highly visible locations. The additional pedestrian light pole in the alley will be a nice safety feature. While the new arm light for the large street lights is modern, it is also more compact and less intrusive than the older arm. Chapter 10.D of the Guidelines explains that box lights are used in the public parking lots and recommends, "use simple box lights, also with a dark finish, only for large parking lots or for intersections where a taller pole is necessary" and "use cobra fixtures only when no other option is practical." The shape of the proposed street lights (the King Luminaire K902) is more attractive than the plain box lights or cobra lights.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Mark Richmond and Parris Zirkenbach. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Zirkenbach wanted to clarify the post-top fixture chosen by the designer was by Mr. Zirkenbach's recommendation as the County will be replacing all the lights in the County over the next 2 to 3 years. This fixture has been picked to replace every post-top light in the County, and it is currently being reviewed by BGE to do upgrades to make the light utility-ready for BGE standards. The fixture is very similar to the colonial high-pressure sodium light which now exists in Ellicott City. Mr. Hauser clarified they are BGE approved lights. Mr. Zirkenbach stated that lights are not actually approved yet, but are in the process of being approved by BGE. Mr. Hauser asked how the approval process is related to the HDC. Mr. Zirkenbach stated nothing as far as the parking lot as this is metered service, but all the lights in other areas of Ellicott City which are public that have the post-top fixture are non-metered service. BGE becomes involved with these lights so these fixtures cannot be replaced until BGE approves them. Mr. Hauser asked about the new lights with arms and down-spotting; how are they different from standard parking lot illumination with glare to adjoining properties. Mr. Zirkenbach stated the post-top lights will not light the parking lot, but the pathways coming down from Court Avenue and down the steps. Ms. Tennor clarified that post-top lights means pedestrian lights. Mr. Zirkenbach stated that was correct. He said there will be two lights in the parking lot which will replace the lights currently hanging off the utility poles on Court Avenue. Mr. Hauser stated this is where he is concerned about the adjoining properties getting glare. Mr. Zirkenbach stated

the LED lights will shine straight down. Mr. Hauser asked if the post-tops are also LED. Mr. Zirkenbach stated that they were LED.

Mr. Zirkenbach showed the Commission on the plan where the new lights will be situated. Mr. Richmond stated the pole in the parking lot will be removed, but the pole on Court Avenue is remaining, just the arm is being removed. Ms. Tennor asked if the proposal is for a single-arm or a quad-arm. Mr. Zirkenbach stated it is a single-arm. Ms. Tennor asked about the 27 parking spaces and how many were there before the parking was reconfigured. Ms. Burgess stated there were 26 spots and with ADA spots, it is now 27 with two ADA. Mr. Zirkenbach stated there was ADA previously, but there was a loading area which has now been changed to ADA. Mr. Richmond stated at first the consultant attempted to maximize parking by placing spots in the middle of the parking lot. This did not work for traffic circulation, so the middle spots were removed.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to Approve as submitted per the Staff recommendation. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-36 – 8374 Court Avenue, Ellicott City

Demolish existing garage, build new garage, pool.

Applicant: David Barber

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the main historic house dates to 1897. The Applicant proposes to demolish the existing garage, which was constructed in the 1960s. The Applicant proposes to construct a new garage in the same location and install a pool, with retaining walls where needed.

The new garage will be constructed with HardiePlank lap siding and wood windows. The HardiePlank siding will be the same color as the historic house. The roof will be a hipped roof, covered in asphalt shingles that will match those on the main historic house. The foundation walls on the new garage that are visible above grade will be clad with a stone to match the color on the historic house. The proposed garage doors will be white carriage style doors. There will be one hinged door and one garage door on the east elevation, two garage doors on the north elevation and two hinged doors and a window on the south elevation. The application states that the new doors will be over head roll up, slide and French doors. Staff is unsure which door will be at which elevation as the drawings do not specify. The window in the garage will match the windows on the main historic house. Two trees will be removed in order to construct the new garage. An exterior sconce, to be brass or copper, will be installed at all door locations.

Two retaining walls will be constructed with Allan block and will be three feet high and three feet wide. The retaining walls will be located next to the pool and the area between the walls will be planted. A retaining wall be constructed from the garage down to an existing granite outcropping and will be built as an extension of the concrete garage foundation wall. This concrete wall will be faced with stone to match the foundation walls, but will take up less space than terracing the wall. This wall will most likely need a railing as a result of the height of the wall. The paving around the pool will be a design of 18 inch concrete paver stones and grass blocks.

Staff Comments: The construction of the new garage complies with Chapter 7.C (page 55) recommendations, such as “if allowed by the size and shape of the property, place new outbuildings to the side or rear of the main building, separated from the main building by a substantial setback” and “design outbuildings visible from a public way to be compatible in scale, form and detailing with historic structures and outbuildings in the neighborhood.” The proposed HardiePlank siding, wood windows and asphalt roof comply with Chapter 7.C (page 55) recommendations, “use materials compatible with the main building on the lot or with historic outbuildings in the immediate neighborhood.” Staff has no

objection to the removal of the existing garage as it is not historic and dates to the 1960s.

The retaining walls comply with Chapter 9.D (page 70) recommendations, “construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures, particularly for features visible from a public way.” The walls will resemble the stone used on the historic structure and the concrete wall will be faced with stone. Chapter 9.D (page 70) of the Guidelines recommends against “new patios of poured concrete slabs in readily visible locations,” however the concrete/grass pavers will be in a unique design, will not be a large expanse of concrete and will not be highly visible from the public right-of-way.

The brass/copper light fixture complies with Chapter 9.E (page 71) recommendations, “choose and locate lighting fixture to be visually unobtrusive. Use dark metal or a similar material” and “place lighting fixtures in traditional locations next to or over a door.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted, contingent upon:

- 1) Clarification of the various door types on the garage.
- 2) Submittal of an appropriate railing type for the concrete retaining wall.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in David Barber and Dee Dee Lancelotta. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Barber wanted to clarify the issue of where the doors are located. He said the two overhead doors are on the north elevation at the street. The slide door is a barn-type slide hinge door located on the east elevation where the existing driveway is now. Mr. Hauser asked if the door will be outside mounting. Mr. Barber stated yes. The door could also be mounted inside, so it will be either inside or outside. Mounting the door inside would keep it from blocking the driveway when open. Mr. Barber stated this hinge door will be made to be as close to the existing hinge door as possible. The door will be wood. Ms. Tennor clarified the overhead rolling doors would face the street. Mr. Barber stated that was correct. There is currently a fence which will have sections of it removed, and then turned into each side of the garage. A new concrete drive will be installed to the garage from the street. Due to the slope, a trench drain will be placed across the driveway to catch any water flow from the street. Mr. Hauser asked about the fence on top of the retainer wall. Ms. Lancelotta stated a similar fence would be done using the same company, with small spheres and about 3 feet 6 inches. Mr. Barber corrected this would cover the difference in elevation with the requirement to have a handrail, so this would be a handrail fence; the manufacturer will make it as close as possible to the existing fence. There is already a fence for the pool in the backyard. Mr. Hauser asked how the pool is fenced off from the front of the house. Mr. Barber stated the current fence goes around the back of the house and is attached to the house, which includes the pool, and is acceptable for pool security. The fence is about 60 inches high.

Ms. Holmes stated the following will be incorporated into the application – ‘a gate will be added where the current fence along the street is and a driveway to correspond to it’. Mr. Hauser added the style of the new fence should match the style of the existing fence.

Ms. Tennor asked about the pool. Mr. Barber stated the pool will be very simple, rectangular, and not elaborate. Mr. Hauser asked about lighting for the pool. Ms. Lancelotta stated there will just be a couple of lights in the pool. Mr. Barber stated at this time there is no plan to add additional lighting as there are already two floodlights in the back.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the application as submitted and with the clarifications on the garage doors and railings. The amendment for the concrete driveway is also included. If a decision is made to have street view lighting for the gardens, the Applicant must come back to Staff for approval. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-37 – 8205 College Avenue, Ellicott City

Pre-application advice to replace siding.

Applicant: John Papania

Background & Scope of Work: Staff is unable to date the building at this time, although it is historic based on the architectural style. While it currently is used as the rectory, that function was originally held by a different building on-site. The Applicant seeks pre-application advice to replace the existing wood vertical board and batten siding with HardiePlank to replicate the existing board and batten. The Applicant also proposes to either strip and repaint the porch railing and repair the existing floor since it is accessible or possibly replace both with a Trex-type material, if approved. There are some steep slopes on this building that do make maintenance on the building difficult.

Staff Comments: Chapter 6.D of the Guidelines explains that “wood is the most common building material in Ellicott City” and that “every effort should be made to repair original wood siding, shingles...and related details such as cornerboards and cornices.” Staff is concerned about removing the wood siding and related wood trim and detailing on the building and trying to replace it with an alternative material. While HardiePlank siding can be a viable option in terms of replacing wood lap siding, it will not replace the gingerbread details on the building. Additionally this building has vertical board and batten siding, which is different from the most commonly seen installation of HardiePlank siding.

The application indicates that the plan is to leave the wood siding and cover it with HaridePlank. Staff recommends against covering the wood siding with HardiePlank as it will change the profile around all of the windows. Chapter 6.D explains that “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.”

The porch decking has already been replaced with a Trex-like material, but the railings are still wood. The building is in need of painting, as the paint is peeling. However, it is possible the paint is lead, based on the manner in which it is peeling. If the building is properly scraped, sanded and repainted, the paint job should hold and only require minor maintenance from year to year. Chapter 6.D (page 29) of the Guidelines state, “when necessary, replace deteriorated wood siding or shingles with wood siding or shingles that match the original as closely as possible in width, shape, and profile. Maintain the original shape and width of details such as cornerboards, cornices and door and window trim.” The wood does not appear to be rotting, but only in need of being repainted. Chapter 6.D (page 30) recommends against “covering or removing sound wood siding.”

Staff Recommendations: Staff has no recommendation as this application is for Pre-Application Advice, but Staff is concerned about removing all of the historic materials on the building.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in John Papania and Father Matthew Buening. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Papania explained that they brought materials from the contractor after reading the Staff comments. Unicorp Energy Services of College Park was requested to provide a proposal of the costs of the buildings since this is an Advisory application. Mr. Papania said that the rectory is very difficult to paint due to the topography, and the costs of painting the building is high so the goal is to be able to do the work once. He said that the current proposal to reside the building is more expensive than painting. Mr. Papania said that he realized one big objection for residing was the profile of the windows. He said that new window framing will be installed to maintain the same profile as is currently in place. Mr. Papania said the gingerbread trim cannot be duplicated; it will be stripped, painted and maintained. The idea is to make the building more

functional, not to change the look of it. Mr. Papania asked about reading the comments into the record. Ms. Burgess stated the comments should be read so everyone has clarity about the new information. Father Buening read the comments from Unicorp into the record.

Mr. Shad asked if an actual quote had been obtained for stripping and repainting the building. Mr. Papania stated a quote was obtained about a year and a half ago; the quote was a little over \$14,000 and would consist of two paint jobs. Mr. Papania said the Hardie would make the building last much longer. Mr. Papania commented that the office building was originally an old African-American school and was approved back in the 1990s for a Hardieboard material. The use of the Hardie would give some consistency on campus. The Hardie on the rectory would be done in a vertical profile, not horizontal and be maintenance free.

Mr. Hauser stated this is a key building in Ellicott City. There are no other buildings like it; it is unique. Mr. Hauser does not want to see this building changed. The building is historic and should be repaired and painted. The building should not have Hardieplank on it as it is very visible. Mr. Hauser advised the Applicant to think about maintaining and repairing the building as it is an important structure.

Father Buening stated he agrees the building is special and the style needs to be kept exact as much as possible. The idea was to find a cost-effective way of fixing the building. Mr. Papania asked if the concern was the material replacement. The intent is to keep the building looking the same. Mr. Hauser stated the guidelines need to be followed for repairing, painting and maintaining the original building materials. The building should not be change with different materials.

Ms. Tennor stated this is consistent with recommendations for windows. Windows should be repaired and painted, not replaced. Mr. Shad would prefer the building to be kept in its original condition.

14-38 – 3592 Fels Lane, Ellicott City

Emergency addition to repair foundation water issues. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Cleveland Ham Jr.

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the house dates to 1922. This application was added as an emergency addition. The Applicant proposes to repair the foundation walls on three sides of the house, which are currently allowing water into the basement of the house. The foundation will be excavated, then repointed and sealed. All walls will be waterproofed. The land will be backfilled to the existing grade and seeded. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Staff Comments: The application is consistent with Chapter 6.C recommendations, “maintain or restore granite buildings, foundations, steps, lintels, sills, fence posts and retaining walls.” The work is also eligible for tax credits as it will protect the foundation of the home and complies with Section 20.112 of the County Code which states that eligible work includes, “work that is necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure with regard to safety, durability, or weatherproofing.”

Staff Recommendations: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Mr. Hauser stated for the record that Mr. Ham contacted him about the application. Mr. Hauser informed Mr. Ham that he could not discuss this and Mr. Ham needed to contact Staff. Mr. Hauser did not recuse himself.

Mr. Taylor clarified an item for Staff and the Commission. There are provisions for emergency meetings. One requirement for an emergency meeting application is that the subject of the application be posted

with the date, time, place and subject matter at least 24 hours immediately prior to the meeting. Mr. Taylor asked if this was done. Ms. Holmes stated yes this was done, and the information was added to the web site more than 24 hours ago. Mr. Taylor advised the Chair and Commission that in order to approve the application the Commission should make a finding on the proposed work that immediate action is required to allow emergency repairs on a structure or to remedy immediate safety or health hazards.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Cleveland and Elsie Ham. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments and asked them to give a brief description of what happened. Mr. Ham stated the foundation is stone and water has been coming in over time. Recent rains have caused water to come through the walls heavily on the right side of the house in the furnace room. He explained that they thought it was the hot water heater, but found out water was coming in through the stone. One side of the house and the front of the house leaks with a heavy rain; the other side adjacent to the neighbor's house will leak periodically. Mr. Shad asked if the basement had a sump pump. Mr. Ham stated no. Mr. Shad asked about outside waterproofing. Mr. Ham stated the contractor would wash the wall down, use foundation coating and poly fabric on top of the coating. The inside will be repointing of the joints, re-mortar and drylock sealed. The water is not coming from the basement area, it is coming through the wall. Mr. Hauser asked about the damage inside. The inside is wet periodically. The inside walls will need to be removed to see what kind of mold has formed. Mr. Hauser asked how soon the contractor can begin the work. Mr. Ham stated he informed the contractor that approval needed to be obtained; the contractor will schedule the work once that is done.

Mr. Taylor stated Staff would like to confer for a moment. Mr. Taylor commented the work clearly needs to be done and asked the Commission's opinion on whether this work needs a Certificate of Approval or not. Mr. Taylor read the section from the Guidelines regarding the requirements for needing a Certificate of Approval. The Commission and Mr. Taylor discussed whether a Certificate would be needed and the nature of the work being done. The Commission will need to decide whether to approve the work and issue tax credit pre-approval, or just allow tax credit pre-approval. Mr. Taylor brought up a point whether an application for tax credits needs to be advertised in the same manner, but the advice for the Commission at this time is to go ahead and take action on the tax credit approval. Mr. Hauser wanted to state for the record that this is found to be routine maintenance. Mr. Taylor asked Staff if they consider this routine maintenance. Ms. Burgess said no. She said that when the foundation is excavated, it is not on a routine basis. Mr. Taylor asked the Commission to go into closed session.

Mr. Hauser moved to go into closed session, off the record. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved. Mr. Hauser resumed the meeting, on record.

Mr. Hauser stated the outcome is that the Commission does not think a Certificate of Approval is needed. The work is being looked at as routine maintenance, as the look of the building is not being affected and the work needs to be done. For the tax credit, there will be a requirement that Staff review the property prior to the work, which has already been done, and then re-check the property again after the work is completed. Staff must be able to state that no grading has been changed or nothing on the house has drastically changed the look of it. Ms. Holmes clarified the tax credit does not cover removing and repairing drywall; the tax credit only covers repair to the actual foundation itself. Mr. Ham stated they were removing the shrubs in front of the house as they were damaged with all the snow this past winter and asked if that would be a problem. Ms. Holmes said that was considered routine maintenance and did not require approval .

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to approve the tax credit for the application for the exterior and structure portion only, no interior renovations or finishes. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

Ms. Badart moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Tennor seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 9:19 p.m.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Joseph Hauser, Chairperson

Carol Stirn, Recording Secretary



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ELlicott City Historic District ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov
410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-1655
TDD 410-313-2323

July Minutes

The sixth regular meeting for the year 2014 of the Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, July 3, 2014 in the C. Vernon Gray Room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, Maryland.

Members present: Joseph Hauser, Chairperson; Lisa Badart; Eileen Tennor; and Allan Shad

Members absent: Sam Crozier

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Lewis Taylor, Dan Bennett, and Lisa Kenney

Chairperson Joseph Hauser opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules of the meeting. Mr. Shad moved to Approve the June 5, 2014 minutes. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. 12-13c – 8472 Hill Street, Ellicott City
2. 14-40 – 3500 Manor Lane, Ellicott City, HO-22
3. 14-41 – 8329-8333 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-325
4. 14-42 – 3771 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City
5. 14-43 – 8293 Main Street, Ellicott City
6. 14-44 – 3786 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City
7. 14-45 – 3765 Church Road, Ellicott City
8. 14-46 – 3749 Church Road, Ellicott City
9. 14-47 – Parking Lot F, Ellicott City
10. 14-48 – 8505-8507 Frederick Road, Ellicott City
11. 14-49 – 3711 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City- withdrawn
12. 14-50 – 8360 Court Avenue, Court Place vicinity, Ellicott City

CONSENT AGENDA

12-13c – 8472 Hill Street, Ellicott City

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Gregory Busch

Background & Scope of Work: The Applicant was pre-approved to make repairs to the house in May 2012. The Applicant now seeks final tax credit approval. The application states that \$10,459.44 was spent on eligible pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$1,045.94 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The application complies with the work pre-approved and the receipts add up to the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-40 – 3500 Manor Lane, Ellicott City, HO-22

Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Camilla Carroll

Background & Scope of Work: This property is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-22, Doughoregan Manor. The Applicant proposes to make exterior repairs to the cow and sheep barns that were constructed around 1780. The Applicant proposes the following work:

- 1) Replace the existing metal roofing with new metal roofing to match the existing.
- 2) Remove and replace all deteriorated wood sheathing with new wood members to match the existing dimension.
- 3) Remove the existing deteriorated wood siding and replace with new lumber of the same dimension.
- 4) Remove deteriorated wood window hatch components and replace with new lumber to match the existing configuration and size and dimension.
- 5) Repair structural cracks in masonry wall using lime putty mortar to match the existing mortar in composition, color, texture and tooling.
- 6) Repair the existing access doors by replacing rotten lumber to the same configuration and dimension as the existing. Re-use the existing historic hardware.
- 7) Prep, prime and paint all exterior woodwork, siding and trim components.
- 8) Use new beige paint color, to match the existing paint color of the other barns on the property.
- 9) The newly installed material roofing will be prepped, primed and painted with appropriate paints to match the hunter green color of other metal roofs on the property.

Staff Comments: The application is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, as the work consists of repairs and in-kind replacement. The application is also consistent with Section 20.112 of the County Code, which explains that eligible work includes, “the repair or replacement of exterior features of the structure” and “work that is necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure with regard to safety, durability or weatherproofing.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-41 – 8329-8333 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-325

Replace roof, tax credit pre-approval, Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: Rob Brennan

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1920. The Applicant proposes to replace the existing metal standing seam front porch roof in-kind to match the existing. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement Program funds for the work.

Staff Comments: The in-kind replacement of the roof is considered Routine Maintenance, which Chapter 6.F of the Guidelines define as “replacing roofing or dormer windows with new materials that exactly match the existing materials.” The application is also consistent with Section 20.112 of the County Code, which explains that eligible work includes, “the repair or replacement of exterior features of the structure” and “work that is necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure with regard to safety, durability or weatherproofing.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-42 –3771 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: Richard Espy

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the house dates to 1798. The Applicant was approved in April 2014 to add an addition to an existing addition located on the rear of their historic house. Maryland Historical Trust (MHT) has an easement on the property and as such, required approval by MHT as well. MHT required a few adjustments to the plan. The original plan called for three 5x5 picture windows on the rear of the house. The Applicant now proposes to install 5 wood 1:1 double hung sash windows with white trim. These windows will match the existing windows on the house and have been approved by MHT.

Staff Comments: The proposed 1:1 windows comply with Chapter 7.A recommendations, which state, “design windows to be similar in size, proportion and arrangement to the existing windows.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-43 –8293 Main Street, Ellicott City

Tax credit pre-approval to replace roof.

Applicant: Michel Tersiguel

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval to replace the existing EPDM membrane roof using in-kind materials. The work will include:

- 1) Remove the existing EPDM membrane and flashings.
- 2) Install 1 inch thick insulation and tapered crickets where required to provide positive drainage.
- 3) Install new wood blocking at roof edge to match insulation height and facilitate installation of new metal edge along gutter edge.
- 4) Furnish and install a 60 mil EPDM membrane roofing system, inclusive of all flashing to ensure a watertight system.
- 5) Furnish and install walkway pads at roof mechanical unit.
- 6) Fabricate and install pre-finished 24 gauge kynar slip flashing at mechanical unit.
- 7) Fabricate and install new counter flashing along wall. The siding will need to be removed and replaced in order to install counter flashing properly.
- 8) Fabricate and install pre-finished 24 gauge kynar coping caps and drip edge.
- 9) Replace wood blocking supports at gas pipes.

Staff Comments: The in-kind replacement of the roof is considered Routine Maintenance, which Chapter 6.F of the Guidelines define as “repairing roofs, including the replacement of small areas of roofing materials, using materials similar to the existing roof in dimensions, shape, color and texture” and “replacing roofing or dormer windows with new materials that exactly match the existing materials.” The application is also consistent with Section 20.112 of the County Code, which explains that eligible work includes, “the repair or replacement of exterior features of the structure” and “work that is necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure with regard to safety, durability or weatherproofing.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-44 –3786 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations

Applicant: Amber Georgieff

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1899. This property is located on Old Columbia Pike, but the back yard is adjacent to Parking Lot D. The Applicant proposes to install an iron fence along the base of the property line bordering Parking Lot D. The Applicant also proposes to install a series of aluminum Boston Garden Posts with chains along the back walkway up to the house.

Staff Comments: The fencing and garden posts/chains comply with Chapter 9.D (page 70) recommendations, “construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures, particularly for features visible from a public way” and “install open fencing, generally not more than five feet high, of wood or dark metal.” The use of the Boston Garden Post is not specifically mentioned in the Guidelines, however, the materials comply with the Guidelines and it is a creative solution to a handrail along the winding steps up to the house.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted. Ms. Badart seconded . The motion was unanimously approved.

14-45 –3765 Church Road, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Archana Leon-Guerrero

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the house dates to 1872. The Applicant proposes to repair or replace the following, with materials to match the existing:

- 1) Deteriorating front/side wraparound wood porch floor, beams, railings and columns.
- 2) Clapboard siding.
- 3) Gutters and downspouts.
- 4) Standing seam metal roof.
- 5) Doors and windows, to be made weathertight and lockable.
- 6) Deteriorating wood shutters.
- 7) Deteriorating wood carriage doors.
- 8) Repaint entire house and carriage house existing color, white with black trim.

The application indicates that the downspouts, gutters and metal roof leak. The photographs included show significant deterioration of the porch and shutters. The carriage doors also show evidence of rot.

Staff Comments: The work is all in-kind repair or replacement of existing features, using the same materials. The application is consistent with Section 20.112 of the County Code which state that eligible work for tax credits includes, “the repair or replacement of exterior features of the structure” and “work that is necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure with regard to safety, durability or weatherproofing.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-46 –3749 Church Road, Ellicott City

Driveway construction.

Applicant: Kimberly Kepnes

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the property dates to 1830. The Applicant proposes to construct a new driveway to access the home. The house currently has one driveway that leads to a garage, but due to the elevation change, there are then 34 steps with 43 paces, including the landings, down to the house. The rear steps have 43 steps with 64 paces to the house. The proposed driveway would be constructed where there is currently a gate opening within the existing fence. The driveway would be constructed to curve along the existing terrain, along the same patterns as the current stair walkway to the home. The driveway would be paved with crushed bluestone with a cobblestone border. There are two small dogwood trees, diameter less than 14 inches, which will be relocated on the property.

Staff Comments: Chapter 9.D explains that new driveways “should be simple in design and require minimal changes to existing topography and natural features...Working with the natural contours of the land will minimize the need to remove mature vegetation and preserve the relationship of historic buildings to the land.” The application complies with Chapter 9.D recommendations which state, “where

needed, install new residential driveways that are narrow (one lane) and follow the contours of the site to minimize the need for clearing and grading. If possible, locate off-street parking spaces in side or rear yards.” The crushed bluestone paving and cobblestone border complies with Chapter 9.D recommendations, “construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures, particularly for features visible from a public way.” This driveway will not be highly visible from the public way and will be located on a large parcel and as such, not overwhelm the house or landscaping.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

14-47 –Parking Lot F, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: Howard County Government, Paul Walsky

Background & Scope of Work: The Applicant proposes to make renovations to Parking Lot F, which is located in the Ellicott City Historic District at Main Street and Ellicott Mills Drive. This is a project on behalf of the County Executive in order to provide public open space, stormwater management and additional parking.

At the south end of the parking lot, a circular plaza will take the place of the ADA parking spaces. The plaza will be brick and contain a foundation that will be constructed at grade, to create a multi-use space. The plaza will contain benches and landscaping. The stream on the east side of the parking lot will be restored and become more visible feature. Walkways will connect the parking lot to the plaza, log cabins and across the stream to the walkway that connects to Court Avenue. The west retaining walls around the historic courthouse will remain but the east side will be re-graded to open more of the courthouse for visual accessibility.

To the east of the parking lot, a bio-retention facility will be constructed to contain water before it enters the stream. The two islands in the middle of the parking lot will also contain a bio-retention facility.

The parking lot will be extended 140 feet toward the Heine House. A retaining wall will be constructed at the northern edge of the extension that will range in height from grade to 9.5 feet. There are two large black walnut trees that will remain, while the other black walnut trees within that area will be removed. The Applicant proposes to plant 17 new evergreen trees north of the new retaining wall, to buffer the view of the Heine House from the parking lot. Shade trees are proposed for the corner and middle islands. The existing sycamore trees located on the west side of the parking lot will remain.

A stairway will be added from Ellicott Mills Drive to provide access into the parking lot and new public space.

Staff Comments: The application generally complies with Chapter 10 recommendations. The brick plaza complies with Chapter 10.A (page 74) recommendations, “when opportunities arise, place concrete sidewalks with brick along Main Street” and “for plazas, driveways, parking lots, walkways and other

paved areas, use stone or stone-like materials as alternatives to asphalt or concrete where practical. The proposed walkways will be concrete; however the existing sidewalk in this area is currently brick. Staff would like to continue using brick sidewalks in this area.

There were no specifications provided for the type of bench or retaining wall material. In discussions the Applicant has mentioned using a metal Victor Stanley bench. For the retaining walls, Staff recommends using a natural stone veneer that comes in large and irregular shapes, to match the granite commonly found in Ellicott City. Staff is concerned about the proposed height of the retaining wall. It would be possible to build a terraced retaining wall at lower heights, but it would require excavating closer toward the Heine House and would encroach upon one of the remaining black walnut trees.

The landscaping shown is all conceptual at this point and will return to the Commission at a later time for approval. However, the Guidelines do recommend, “retain mature trees and shrubs. Provide for their replacement when necessary” and “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.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval, contingent upon:

- 1) A finalized retaining wall material
- 2) A finalized bench type
- 3) Continuing the use of brick sidewalks
- 4) A finalized bridge design, including materials

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Mr. Paul Walsky. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Walsky explained that the lot improves pedestrian circulation and access and creates a park like setting, which is missing in Ellicott City. He also explained the layout and proposed plan of stormwater management.

Mr. Hauser asked Mr. Walsky to address the staff comments regarding materials used in the design. Mr. Walsky explained that the walkway would be brick between Main Street and the proposed plaza area and that the plaza area itself would be brick, but the bridge walkway would be concrete. He further explained that the benches would be traditional Victor Stanley benches, and would match the streetscape in Ellicott City.

Mr. Hauser asked which type of Victor Stanley bench would be used. Mr. Walsky said that possibly a metal bench would be used and be color coordinated with the surrounding area. He also stated that a final decision on the design has not been made. Mr. Hauser asked about the bridge materials and Mr. Walsky stated that metal or wrought iron were possibilities. Mr. Hauser asked about the proposed retaining wall. Mr. Walsky explained that terracing the wall would be out of character with existing walls in Ellicott City, and one large wall would look like the rest of the town. He further explained that they would use granite veneered to look like a historic stone wall.

Mr. Hauser asked about the proposed plan for water retention and storm water management. Mr. Walsky explained the proposal would have the existing piped stream adjacent to Ellicott Mills Drive, be relocated under parking lot F and be daylight and outfall into the existing stream on the east side of the proposed parking lot. Mr. Hauser stated that it would be a substantial amount of water, and asked if the stream would hold it. Mr. Walsky stated stream experts felt it was feasible, but a study would need to be done first.

Ms. Tennor asked if the plan could be presented to the Commission with a landscape plan proposal. Mr. Walsky stated that yes they could present a landscape plan once it is complete. Ms. Burgess explained that the current plan is coming before the Commission as a concept plan, before the construction drawings are done. She said that usually the Commission reviews a finalized plan, but this time the plan

is coming to them early, in order to make any necessary changes before engineering the plan.

Ms. Badart asked about the time frame of plan completion. Mr. Walsky answered that it would be towards the end of the year for the stream and stormwater management, which would have to go through MDE, making it the slowest part of the process.

Ms. Tennor asked about the measurements of the retaining wall. Mr. Walsky stated the height at its tallest would be 9.5 feet, but would slope down to zero feet on either side. Ms. Tennor explained she was concerned about having fencing at the top of the retaining wall, but was interested in adding a connection up to the historic Fort Heine House. Mr. Walsky explained that a connection would not be appropriate due to the existing steep slopes. He further explained that terracing the wall instead of one wall would not be in character with Ellicott City historic area. Ms. Tennor suggested changing the small island of trees to a peninsula of trees.

Ms. Tennor asked about the proposed lighting along the parking lot. Mr. Walsky explained that there are current lights in the parking lot, but they will be changed to a BGE standard. He further explained a plan for pedestrian lighting in the 12 foot range, and suggested also adding lower lighting with low impact on surrounding area.

Mr. Shad asked about the reasons for the stream relocation. Mr. Walsky explained the location of a large drainage area coming down Ellicott Mills which ties into underground pipes and spills into an existing stream, which will therefore provide better water quality. He stated that stormwater management studies will be evaluated by an engineer.

Ms. Holmes asked the Commission what their thoughts were if one of the black walnut trees that is to remain was removed in order to terrace the wall and then have more appropriate tree for a parking lot (in terms of dropping debris) be planted. Mr. Walsky stated that the two trees being saved are in very good condition, however the other trees are not. He stated a few trees would be removed.

Mr. Hauser asked if a porous surface versus asphalt would be more appropriate for the parking lot. Mr. Walsky stated that a porous surface could be looked at, however if the ground is compacted clay then it would not allow water to soak in.

Ms. Tennor asked if this plan was doubling the paved area. Mr. Walsky stated that it is not quite double. Ms. Burgess stated currently there is no bioretention and the proposed plan indicates a large bioretention area in the middle of the parking lot.

Mr. Hauser stated the historic structure should be seen, not blocked off with large evergreens but should have understory planting. Mr. Walsky agreed and suggested planting slow growing hollies and eastern red buds to add flowering trees. Mr. Hauser also suggested some evergreens along the stream.

Mr. Hauser asked if anyone was present to give testimony to this project. Mr. Hauser swore in Ms. Grace Kubofcik who presented testimony on behalf of Andy Hall, President of the Ellicott City Historic District Partnership. Ms. Kubofcik stated support for the concept proposal, as well as supporting the importance of a gathering space close to Main Street. She recommended that the retaining wall be a terraced wall instead of one large wall and recommended that parking lot space by 8390 Main Street act as open space. Ms. Kubofcik further stated that now is the time to talk to the property owner at 8390 Main regarding connecting the existing parking lot to the proposed parking lot. Ms. Badart inquired about Ms. Kubofcik's support of terracing instead of one retaining wall. Ms. Kubofcik stated her concerns with the height of the wall and abruptness of the wall given a natural slope exists. She also stated that the group is seeing more and more proposals around Main Street, which incorporates large walls and thought a sloping terrace would be better.

Mr. Rob Brennan an Ellicott City architect, was sworn in and spoke in support of the proposed plan. He also explained several ideas for the parking area at 8390 Main Street concerning community and functional use. Mr. Brennan spoke in support of a terraced wall instead of one large retaining wall. Ms. Badart asked if Mr. Brennan's terracing idea would cause problems with car headlights. Mr. Walsky stated that vehicle circulation would not be a problem and the cars are a lower grade to what could be viewed. Ms. Tennor suggested adding stairs to connect to the Fort Heine property to break up the mass of the wall.

Mr. Hauser sworn in Ms. Kimberly Kepnes who suggested adding an art element that could give the history of the area, or a dedication of some sort. Ms. Badart asked about the possibility of continuing with the proposed design with a provision for use of the parking lot at 8390 Main Street. Mr. Walsky stated his ideas of a possible larger parking lot and some parkland. Mr. Hauser commented that outdoor entertainment has to be licensed, and advised the Commission not to look at the proposed different uses of adjacent sites that is not owned by the Applicant.

Mr. Hauser moved to go into recess; Ms. Badart seconded. The Commission obtained legal advice on administrative procedures during their recess.

Mr. Hauser asked Mr. Walsky to amend the application from a Certificate of Approval to Advisory Comments, which would mean the Commission would not make a decision and the application would come back at a later time with more concrete details. Mr. Walsky stated his agreement to change his application to Advisory Comments and submit an application with further specifications to the project.

Mr. Hauser stated that the parking lot and bioretention ponds are good, however the features would need more detail. Mr. Hauser asked if Mr. Walsky could come back before the Commission with more specifics on benches, fountain, bridge, wall, lighting, landscape and paving. Ms. Badart said she agrees with Mr. Hauser that more details are needed. She also said she agrees about having one large retaining wall versus a terraced wall. Ms. Tennor stated her agreement with one retaining wall. She also stated her idea to add plantings and stairs to break up the wall. Mr. Shad stated he had no other comments.

Mr. Walsky explained the fountain idea was a request from the County Executive to see a water feature utilized in the open space. He said the fountain would be interactive, similar to the one at the Inner Harbor. Mr. Shad said that paving the fountain in brick would be a better blend and a nice feature. Ms. Burgess inquired about the vertical height of spray nozzles to the fountain. Mr. Walsky stated water height would be 6 or 7 feet, but could also fluctuate. Ms. Badart asked what the diameter of the fountain area would be. Mr. Walsky stated the paved fountain area would be 15 feet in diameter and be centered in the plaza allowing space for people to walk around the fountain without getting wet. The Commission had no objection to the concept of the parking lot expansion and the creation of the open space.

Motion: The Commission accepts the Applicant's withdrawal of the application for a Certificate of Approval to instead receive Advisory Comments. The Applicant will submit a new application for approval when more details are finalized.

14-48 – 8505-8507 Frederick Road, Ellicott City

Demolition of house .

Applicant: Mojan Bagha

Background & Scope of Work: According to Sanborn maps, the house, which is a duplex, dates to 1899.

The County Architectural Historian has also surveyed the house and has confirmed the building was constructed in the 1890s. The Applicant seeks approval to demolish the existing house. The Applicant was previously granted approval to demolish the house, but that approval has since expired. The construction of the new house is still valid and will expire in March 2015.

Case History

In October 2010 the Applicant first presented plans to the Commission to demolish the historic house and build a duplex in its place. The Commission was not satisfied with the design of the new construction and some questioned whether the historic house should remain. The Commission voted to continue the meeting until February 2011 to allow the Applicant time to explore other options. At the February 2011 meeting the Commission approved the demolition of the historic home and the construction of a new home in its place. The Applicant returned in August 2011 with modified plans to construct a two-story house, with full attic and exposed ground level basement. Staff was concerned the two-story house, with full attic and exposed ground level basement was out of character with the neighborhood. The Commission agreed that the proposed house was out of character, giving the appearance of a 4-story building. The Commission approved the application with the following changes:

The house will be changed from the current proposal back to the original approved drawing of the 2,000 square foot front façade. The first floor elevation of the new structure is going to be no more than one foot higher than the doorsill of the house to the right. The roof eave fascia should be within one foot of the fascia of the house to the right. The roof pitch will be adjusted to attempt to have the ridge line below the neighboring house; if the line is slightly higher it will be allowed, but no more than one foot higher. The items on the material list are approved with changes to the windows, doors, siding, and lighting:

- 1) The windows will have 3-4" of exterior trim added to both the front and sides.
- 2) The siding will be changed to a 5" exposure.
- 3) The doors will be standard wooden doors.
- 4) There will just be one light mounted at the entrance.
- 5) All other items will remain the same with no changes.

The gutters should be half-round or K style white aluminum. The columns will be square and plain white. The railings will be standard colonial. The dormers will be switched to the back. The final permit drawings will be brought back to Staff for review of the elevations of the floor, eave, and roof line, and is subject to approval per the Commission's recommendations. The drawings will show the elevations on the house next door so that Staff can see how everything lines up.

In January 2012 the Applicant returned to the Commission with two new proposals; the first showed a side elevation of the house at the first floor elevation as approved in August. The second proposal showed a side elevation of the house at a higher elevation than was approved in August. The Applicant preferred to build at the higher elevation, which would have resulted in changes to the front elevation of the new house. The Commission indicated they would not approve the house at the higher elevation and the Applicant withdrew the proposal.

In March 2012 the Applicant submitted new plans and proposed constructing a 3-story duplex house with a mansard roof. The first floor of the house will serve as the basement level and be constructed into the hillside. The current proposed house will have a first floor elevation of 230.8 feet. The neighboring house has a first floor elevation of 230.6 feet. The roof peak elevation on the proposed house will be 260.1 feet and the neighboring house has a roof peak elevation of 258.3 feet, so the new house will be 1.8 feet higher than the neighboring house.

The Commission approved this application with the following motion:

Mr. Hauser moved to Approve per the Staff recommendation, except for #4 regarding the use of real stone. Instead of real stone, a faux stone may be used on the sides of the house on the 1st floor exposed walls. The stone needs to be brought in to Staff for their approval, but if siding is used it does not need to be approved by Staff. Trim is to be added on the front façade windows and doors. The side windows are to be lined up. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Staff Comments: The Applicant has listed the property for sale and has had several interested parties come to the Department of Planning and Zoning to research the property. Staff has requested drawings for the construction of the new house, to show all of the changes that were approved in case HDC-12-07. The house was previously approved to be demolished. Staff has no objection to re-issuing demolition approval.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the demolition of the house with the stipulation that the new construction will conform to the requirements required by the Commission and will not be more than 1.8 feet higher than the house, use 3-4" exterior trim, siding with a 5" exposure, Jeld-Wen 6-paneled wood doors and 1:1 Andersen Narroline vinyl clad wood window and square wood porch posts and railings.

Testimony: Mr. Taylor asked staff asked for clarification regarding staff statement of expired HDC Mr. Hauser swore in Mr. John Komsa who explained that the existing demolition permit is still valid, however the Commission approval has expired. He also stated that building permit is approved pending the Commission approval of demolition.

Mr. Shad questioned what was for sale, a house and lot or an empty lot. Mr. Komsa explained that the lot is for sale with an approved plan for a new house. Mr. Shad stated that the owner could sell the lot, however they are not obligated to use the plan that is already approved.

The Commission discussed the demolition being approved, than the lot would be vacant with no legal requirements for new owners to use the existing approved plan. Mr. Taylor explained that any new house would have to come before the Commission in order to be built.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve application for reinstatement of demolition. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-49 – 3711 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City

Demolition of building.

Applicant: Donald Reuwer

The application was deferred until the August 2014 meeting.

14-50 – 8360 Court Avenue, Court Place vicinity, Ellicott City

Streetscape improvements.

Applicant: Howard County Government, Department of Planning and Zoning and Department of Public Works

Background & Scope of Work: The Applicant proposes to make streetscape improvements along Court Place and within the vicinity of 8360 Court Avenue. These improvements include planters, lamp post fixtures, benches, trash cans, hanging flower baskets, landscaping, sidewalks and crosswalks.

The Applicant proposes to replace approximately 30 globe style luminaries on the lamp posts with a more appropriate lantern style, which is more commonly seen in Ellicott City. Twenty-four hanging baskets will be added to the lamp posts around the Courthouse.

The Applicant proposes to install a new trashcan at the intersection of Court Place and Court Avenue and add one at the gateway to the sidewalk. There are three trashcans at the main entrance of the courthouse that will be replaced and relocated as found appropriate.

Six benches will be installed along the walkway from Court Place to the Courthouse parking lot to include: 1 bench on Court Avenue, 1 bench in the south courtyard patio, 2 benches on the west side of the courthouse, 1 bench adjacent to the main entrance and 1 bench adjacent to the entrance closest to the parking lot. The Applicant also proposes to install 3 tables and 12 chairs in the south courtyard patio. The benches will be a Victory Stanley model, similar to the existing benches.

The Applicant proposes to add two 2-inch caliper flowering dogwood trees in the south courtyard plantings beds. Six landscape planters will be added along Court Place and the south courtyard patio. The planters will be a mix of a traditional style concrete and a black composite commercial grade material, to resemble wood. While wood would be the best choice for Main street in terms of appearance, the Applicant would like to install the composite for durability and rot resistance.

The existing crosswalk on Park Avenue (the main entrance to the Courthouse) will be replaced with a new crosswalk. A crosswalk will be added on Court Avenue at the intersection of Court Place, to guide pedestrians safely across the street in conjunction with the renovations to Parking Lot E. The sidewalks will also be replaced. The concrete square pavers along Court Place are in poor shape, cracked and unstable but are not available for replacement. They will be replaced with a light grey tinted poured concrete sidewalk.

Staff Comments: The application is consistent with Chapter 10 recommendations. The replacement of the globe luminaries with a lantern style complies with Chapter 10.D (page 77) recommendations, “whenever possible, use a consistent design of light poles and fixtures within a given area of the historic district” and “when new streetlights or parking lot lights are needed, install traditional style, post-top fixtures made of dark metal or a material that resembles dark metal, particularly in highly visible locations.”

The benches comply with Chapter 10.C (page 76) recommendations, “use street furniture that is simple in design and constructed of traditional materials such as wood and dark metal.” The planters comply with Chapter 10.C (page 76) recommendations, “use street furniture that is simple in design and constructed of traditional materials such as wood and dark metal.” While the planters are not wood or metal, they will be a durable composite material designed to look like wood. The concrete planters are also commercial grade and durable and traditional in design.

The trash cans and benches comply with Chapter 10.C (page 76) recommendations, “improve consistency in design through the historic district for items such as street lights, traffic signals, public signage, trash receptacles and other street furniture.”

Chapter 10.A (page 74) of the Guidelines explains, “a variety of paving materials can be used as alternatives to asphalt or concrete. The brick sidewalks and crosswalks used along portions of Main Street blend well with the mix of historic building materials.” Chapter 10.A (page 74) recommends, “when opportunities arise, replace concrete sidewalks with brick along Main Street between Ellicott Mills Drive and the Patapsco River.” The stamped asphalt has not yet been determined to be the final product, but research has shown it to be a durable product. Staff is still exploring the use of pavers for crosswalks. The goal with replacing the crosswalks is to have one consistent design used throughout

Ellicott City. Additionally, the sidewalks along Court Place will not be replaced with brick due to the steep nature of the street. For this location, replacing the sidewalks with concrete makes the most sense.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Ms. Beth Burgess who explained the proposed project as a continuation of Lot E in Ellicott City. She said that the County Executive tasked the Department of Planning and Zoning to beautify the streetscape along Court Place, connecting the new stairs from Lot E with the Courthouse campus. She said that the Department of Planning and Zoning will work with the Department of Public Works to purchase and install the proposed items.

Mr. Hauser asked if the steps would really be used by the public. Ms. Burgess explained that the steps are not only for the average tourist, but also individuals with business at the Courthouse, and overflow parking during special events. Ms. Tennor asked if the existing lighting is sufficient or if new lighting would be added. Ms. Burgess stated the existing lighting is sufficient, however the round globes are not in character with the historic structure of the Courthouse and will be changed. Ms. Tennor stated that the scale of planters should match the scale of the courthouse and also asked about the maintenance of the plans. Ms. Burgess stated that the Department of Recreation and Parks would handle maintenance for plants. Mr. Shad asked how the project was being funded. Ms. Burgess explained that the funds were part of the County Executive's approved budget and that the funds are not part of the State Façade Improvement. Mr. Hauser asked about using different materials on such a steep slope. Ms. Burgess stated that several options were reviewed, however a stained grey concrete was the material decided on for safety and maintenance.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Badart moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Tennor seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Joseph Hauser, Chairperson

Lisa Kenney, Recording Secretary



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ELlicott City Historic District ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov
410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-1655
TDD 410-313-2323

August Minutes

The seventh regular meeting for the year 2014 of the Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, August 7, 2014 in the C. Vernon Gray Room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, Maryland.

Members present: Joseph Hauser, Chairperson; Lisa Badart; Eileen Tennor; and Allan Shad

Members absent: Sam Crozier

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Lewis Taylor, Dan Bennett, and Lisa Kenney

Chairperson Joseph Hauser opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules of the meeting. Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the July 3, 2014 minutes. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. 14-21c – 8069 Main Street, Ellicott City
2. 14-51 – 8202 Main Street, Ellicott City
3. 14-52 – 8378 Court Avenue, Ellicott City
4. 14-53 – 8239 Main Street, Ellicott City
5. 14-54 – 8247 Main Street, Ellicott City
6. 14-55 – 8000 Main Street, Ellicott City
7. 14-56 – 8249 Main Street, Ellicott City
8. 14-57 – 8321 Main Street, Ellicott City
9. 14-58 – 8505 Hill Street, Ellicott City
10. 14-59 – Court Place, vicinity of 8360 Court Place, Ellicott City

CONSENT AGENDA

14-21c – 8069 Main Street, Ellicott City

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Len Berkowitz

Background & Scope of Work: The Applicant has submitted documentation that \$8,200.00 was spent on eligible pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$2,050.00 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The Applicant was pre-approved in May 2014 to paint the exterior of the building. The invoice includes a line item for \$150 concrete repair, which was a repair to stucco on the building prior to painting. The work complies with that pre-approved.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the final tax credit as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve to the application. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-52 – 8378 Court Avenue, Ellicott City

Tax credit pre-approval to paint exterior.

Applicant: George and Vickie Goeller

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the house dates to 1911. The Applicant proposes to paint the house, using the existing Behr paint color scheme. The metal roof will be painted red (Red Baron), the porch ceiling will be light blue (Pools of Blue), the porch floor will be a medium blue (Porch Song), the siding will be a light gray-blue (Pelican Bay), the shutters and lattice will be a dark blue (Night Tide), and the trim will be ultra pure white.

Staff Comments: The application states the color will match the existing colors. While some of the colors appear to be different shades, the existing colors have most likely faded over time. The application is considered routine maintenance as defined in Chapter 6.N (page 50) of the Guidelines which defines routine maintenance as, "Painting previously painted surfaces using the same color as the existing paint." The application is eligible for historic tax credits per Section 20.112 of the County Code, which requires pre-approval.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the application. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-53 – 8239 Main Street, Ellicott City

Paint exterior. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program.

Applicant: Steve Burgess

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to repair and replace all rotted wood on the fascia board, trim and window area. The Applicant proposes to paint the exterior of the building. The building is currently light green with off-white trim on the first floor and maroon with green shutters and off-white trim on the second floor. The Applicant proposes to paint the first floor of the building a medium subdued purple called Benjamin Moore Kasbah (Af-640) with a light gray trim called Nightingale (AF-670). The shutters will be painted Nightingale. The Applicant will paint the second floor a deeper purple (similar to an eggplant color) called Caponata (AF-650). Both doors on the first floor will be painted in Caponata. The existing cream color adjacent to the doors and beadboard ceiling overhang will be painted Nightingale.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6.N (page 50) recommendations, "use colors appropriate to the period and style of the building" and "use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim." The work is also eligible for historic tax credits per Section 20.112 of the County Code.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the application. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-55 – 8000 Main Street, Ellicott City

Paint exterior. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Kay Sandler

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to paint all previously painted surfaces on the building, which include the front windows, dormer windows, soffits, doors and trim. On the rear of the building there is also wood siding and a black metal staircase. The trim will be painted white to match the existing and the staircase black to match the existing.

Staff Comments: The application is considered routine maintenance as defined in Chapter 6.N (page 50) of the Guidelines which defines routine maintenance as, “Painting previously painted surfaces using the same color as the existing paint.” The application is eligible for historic tax credits per Section 20.112 of the County Code, which requires pre-approval.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved once the final bid is received. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to approve. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-54 – 8247 Main Street, Ellicott City

Paint exterior. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program.

Applicant: Kelli Myers

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1920. The Applicant proposes to paint the front façade of the building a new color scheme. The new colors will be:

- 1) Door – Redstone, a red/orange
- 2) Trim – Harwood Putty (CW-5), off-white
- 3) Shutters – Redstone(2009-10), a red/orange
- 4) 1st and 2nd floor siding – Florida Keys Blue (2050-40), light blue/turquoise
- 5) 3rd floor mansard and dormer windows shingles – Newport green (2050-30), a dark blue/green

Staff Comments: The proposed colors comply with Chapter 6.N recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The Redstone is a bright color, but will be used on the doors and shutters and is compatible with the other colors. The Newport green used on the 3rd floor will be darker than the façade as the 3rd floor appears to be more like a mansard roof but the color scheme will complement each other. The Redstone and Florida Keys Blue are also being proposed for use on the neighboring building at 8249 Main Street.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: Mr. Taylor stated the record should reflect that Ms. Tennor arrived as staff was giving the report for case 14-45. Kelli Meyers of Ellicott City was sworn in. Mr. Hauser asked if she had anything to add or correct to the Staff comments. Ms. Meyers said the only thing that has changed was that instead of using the Harwood Putty for the trim color, she is proposing to use White Dove.

Ms. Badart confirmed where the colors would on the building. Ms. Meyers said the the Florida Blue would be the main building color; door will be reddish orange; 3rd floor will be Newport green. Ms. Meyers explained the first and second floor would be the Florida Blue. Ms. Badart said she found it ‘perky’ but not unacceptable. Ms. Meyers explained it is the color scheme for her store and logo and that was the idea for the color concept.

Ms. Eileen confirmed that all the trim will be in the neutral color. Mr. Shad confirmed the shutters will be reddish orange color and asked if the missing shutter would be replaced. Ms. Meyers stated it would be replaced and was in the basement.

Mr. Hauser asked if the colors were chosen from Benjamin Moore palette. Ms. Burgess asked if he was referring to all of the colors that were approved at one time. Ms. Burgess explained that in this phase of painting, many of the owners were choosing the colors themselves, whereas Benjamin Moore chose the colors previously. Ms. Burgess stated that the Commission had requested more variety in colors than what Benjamin Moore had chosen. Mr. Hauser stated that the Guidelines explain that buildings should be painted in muted colors and limit the number of colors used. Ms. Hauser said there are four colors on this building and there should be two colors and that three colors is the most they’ve allowed. He found the red too bright and did not find the blue to be a historic color to Ellicott City. Ms. Meyers said there was a similar blue on the historic color chart. Mr. Hauser said he did not find them to be historic to Ellicott City.

Ms. Burgess said there was one blood orange color on the Benjamin Moore palette the Commission had approved, but that scope of work got cut. Mr. Hauser said they have made errors in the past with paint and he felt it was going to be very bright for the first couple of years and thought it would be a mistake to paint.

Ms. Meyers said she could paint the shutters in the darker Newport green or White Dove. Mr. Hauser said that it was only him objecting at that point.

Ms. Badart asked Mr. Hauser what he thought if shutters were a different color and only the door was red. Mr. Hauser said the door needs to be darker. Ms. Holmes pointed out there are other bright doors in town. Ms. Meyers explained that it was not a full solid door, there was a full lite window in door and the door was recessed.

Ms. Tennor said she thought she had a good understanding about the palettes they deliberated over were to be used by the merchants. Ms. Taylor said this is not a Benjamin Moore Paint What Matters Project, this is an independent project.

Ms. Badart asked why she chose to paint the third level in darker color. Ms. Meyers explained that the third floor is also a roof and that with rainwater coming down, the darker color would probably hide dirt better.

Ms. Tennor confirmed the Redstone color will only be applied in the frame of the glass door. Ms. Meyers said she wanted it on shutters but can do a different color on the shutters if the Commission is opposed to it. Ms. Tennor thought it would be great on the door, but not the shutters.

Ms. Holmes informed the Commission that the Maryland Historical Trust does not review paint colors, explaining that they are usually the stricter entity.

Ms. Tennor stated that she would not object if red stone color was restricted to the door, however she did not approve of the shutters being the red orange color as it would be too bright. Ms. Badart stated that the bright door color would be an inviting entryway.

Ms. Tennor stated that the green or white colors would be better for the shutter color. Ms. Meyers stated that she would prefer the white versus the green, but expressed concern that the white would show dirt too easily. Ms. Tennor asked if they were allowed to leave it open on the shutters or make a decision. Ms. Holmes said they could leave it open and let the Applicant decide.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve the colors as submitted, restricting the red stone color to the door only and that the shutters match the white dove trim color. Ms. Tennor seconded. Three approved in favor, Mr. Hauser objected. The motion passed.

REGULAR AGENDA

Ms. Tennor arrived 7:13 p.m.

14-56 – 8249 Main Street, Ellicott City

Paint exterior. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program.

Applicant: Kelli Myers

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1920. The Applicant proposes to paint the first floor exterior and clean and paint the existing awning. Using Benjamin Moore paints, the door will be painted Redstone (2009-10), a red/orange color, the trim (transom windows, side door frame) will be off-white and the ceiling and storefront panels will be Florida Keys Blue (2050-40), a light blue/turquoise color. The awning will be painted to match the existing colors, the white will be refreshed and the red trim will be repainted using the same shade as the front door, the Redstone. The side door will be replaced with a solid wood panel exterior door and painted Redstone.

Staff Comments: The proposed colors comply with Chapter 6.N recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on

neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The Redstone is a bright color, but will be used on the doors. The main door on the building has a glass panel, so the bright color will make the door stand out. The side door is solid, but the color may blend with the surrounding brick and not appear as bright. The red and light blue are also being proposed for use on the neighboring building at 8247 Main Street. The side door is not secure and the wood has split at its base. The Applicant has not yet submitted information regarding the replacement door, but has indicated it will be a wood, paneled door. The replacement of the door with a paneled wood door complies with Chapter 6.G (page 37) recommendations, “when repair is not possible, replace historic doors and entrance features with features of the same size, style and finish.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted, contingent upon receiving information for an appropriate wood paneled door.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, availability of funds. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: Ms. Meyers was already sworn in. Ms. Holmes explained that she passed out a photo of a door that Ms. Meyers found. Ms. Holmes stated that she and Ms. Burgess were not sure if it was the most appropriate door, but explained that the Applicant didn’t have a standard door size but had a small dooropening. Ms. Meyers explained that the only door she could find in such an odd size and that the existing door was in poor condition and needed to be replaced. Ms. Meyers stated it was not her door, it leads to the apartments, but she is renting the building and wanted to fix it. Mr. Hauser stated that his opinion remained the same on colors for the door.

Ms. Holmes recommended the Applicant try and find a door from the Habitat Restore or The Loading Dock. Mr. Hauser stated that any lumber company could make the door with the correct dimensions as well as add weather proofing value. Mr. Hauser said to be careful buying used doors, because they will need to be shaved down to fit. Mr. Hauser asked what the dimensions were. Ms. Meyers said it was around 31.5 inches by 79.5 inches. Mr. Hauser said she should be able to find a stock door if she called a lumber company. Mr. Hauser stated that the Applicant could contact TW Perry or Johnson Lumber Company to match the existing door style.

Ms. Tennor asked if the Commission could give Ms. Meyers the opportunity to locate an alternate door option and then submit it to Staff for approval. Ms. Meyers asked for details about what kind of door she should be looking for and why the door she found wasn’t appropriate. Ms. Burgess stated the paneling suggestion was not appropriate. Mr. Shad stated that the door should match the existing door in style. Ms. Burgess stated the bottom is two panels and top half is one full rectangular panel, for three panels total.

Ms. Holmes confirmed for the record that the Commission was not approving the door style submitted, but leaving the option for Staff to approve an alternate door style.

Ms. Badart asked if the only red orange color would be in the door. Ms. Meyers stated that only the trim of the door would be the red orange color since the door is full glass panel. She said that the new side door would also be in the Redstone color.

Ms. Badart confirmed this door was on the side of the building. Ms. Meyers said she would paint the

door any color, but wants it to look better because it is the first thing people see when entering from Parking Lot D. Ms. Badart stated that she was not in favor of the red stone color on the side door. Ms. Meyers asked if the Florida Blue or Newport Green color would be acceptable. Ms. Tennor said the darker color would be good.

Ms. Holmes stated that the metal awning has a red stripe that currently exists and that will be refreshed with the Redstone as well. Ms. Meyers stated that the awning would be power washed and cleaned up and only painting the red stripe that is chipping and rusting.

Ms. Badart stated that the only color that is actually changing is that the current white areas would be Florida Blue. Ms. Meyers said the trim would be white.

Ms. Meyers stated her plan to paint the back entry door. Ms. Holmes said that was not specified in the application. Ms. Meyers said there is a glass storm door and solid back door and they originally wanted to paint it with the Redstone color, to match all the doors. Ms. Badart stated that the front door should be Redstone color to let customers know it is the main entrance and that the side and back doors should be the Florida Blue color.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to Approve as per Staff recommendation, with the color of side door changed to the Newport Green and the trim and other colors be approved as submitted, with the application amended to include the rear door, which will be painted Newport Green color and that the style of the residential entrance be submitted to staff for final approval, based on the discussion tonight and will be similar to the existing door. Ms. Badart seconded. Three approved in favor, Mr. Hauser objected. The motion passed.

14-57 – 8321 Main Street, Ellicott City

Install sign.

Applicant: Ellicott City Historic District Partnership

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1920. The Applicant proposes to install a wood sign on an existing black metal bracket. The sign will be 12.75 inches height and 25 inches wide for a total of 6 square feet. The background of the sign will be off-white and the text will be black. The sign will read on three lines:

Ellicott City Historic District PARTNERSHIP

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommendations, “use simple, legible words and graphics” and “keep letters minimum and the message brief and to the point. In many cases, symbols or illustrations that communicate the nature of the business can be used.” The sign will only be two colors, black and white, which complies with Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommendations, “use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three. Coordinate sign colors with the colors used in the building façade.” The sign will also be wood, which complies with Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommendations, “use historically appropriate materials such as wood or iron for signs and supporting hardware. Select hardware that blends with the style of the sign and is neither flimsy nor excessively bulky.” The sign will re-use the existing metal bracket.

The sign will be six square feet, which complies with Chapter 11.B (page 84) recommendations, “limit the sign area to be in scale with the building. Projecting or hanging signs of four to six square feet are appropriate for many of Ellicott City’s small, attached commercial buildings.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Edward Lilley. Mr. Hauser asked if Mr. Lilley had anything to add or correct to the Staff comments. Mr. Lilley stated he did not. Ms. Tennor asked if the sign would be double faced and Mr. Lily answered yes. Ms. Tennor asked how the panel would be connected and Mr. Lilley stated that it would be connected with eye hooks.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve application as submitted. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-58 – 8505 Hill Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs and alterations. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Nolan Redd

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the house dates to 1838. The Applicant proposes to remove and replace the roof shingles in-kind using a 3-tab Tamko asphalt shingle in Rustic Black. The Applicant also proposes to remove and replace the siding on two dormers using T-111 siding, which will match the existing siding. The two wood dormer windows will be replaced with Marvin wood double hung windows and will match the existing 6:6 wood windows. All woodwork will be painted a cream color to match the existing. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6.D (page 30) recommendations, “when necessary, replace deteriorated wood siding or shingles with wood siding or shingles that match the original as closely as possible in width, shape and profile. Maintain the original shape and width of details such as cornerboards, cornices and door and window trim.” Chapter 6.D (page 30) of the Guidelines also considers this work Routine Maintenance, “replacing deteriorated siding or shingles with materials that exactly match the existing siding or shingles and do not cover or alter details such as cornerboards, door and window trim and cornices.”

One of the existing dormer windows appears to have been replaced previously. The other window does appear to be older but is in poor condition. The windows are not highly visible from the street due to the height of the house and the limited width of the street. The replacement of both windows will make the window types consistent and make the more recently replaced window more appropriate as the existing appears to have flat muntins. The replacement windows will have a simulated divided light with a 7/8” external muntin. The replacement of the windows complies with Chapter 6.H (page40) recommendations, “when repair is not possible, replace original windows, frames and related details with features that fit the original openings and are of the same style, material, finish and window pane configuration. If possible, reproduce frame size and profile and muntin detailing” and “replace inappropriate modern windows with windows of appropriate style.”

The work is also eligible for historic tax credits per Section 20.112 of the County Code.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Nolan Redd. Mr. Hauser asked if he had anything to add or correct to the Staff comments. Mr. Redd stated he did not. Mr. Shad asked if the existing dormers were T-111 and Mr. Redd answered yes. Mr. Shad asked if other materials were considered, going back to what was original. Mr. Redd stated that they were going with what as in-kind. Mr. Shad stated that T111 dormers were not really historic and asked if another material could be considered.

Ms. Badart asked what the cost difference in materials would be. Mr. Redd asked what material would be considered historic. Mr. Hauser stated that plain lap siding would be fine and that at that height above the street a smooth HardiePlank would be fine as it wouldn't be visible and would last longer.

Ms. Tennor asked about the orientation of the existing siding. Mr. Redd stated that it is currently parallel to the pitch of the roof; however it should be installed level. Ms. Tennor stated that the new siding should be level, not parallel to pitch of the roof.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve application as submitted with an amendment to change siding on the dormers to smooth lap HardiePlank siding, reveal of their choice, and installed level. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-59 – Court Place, vicinity of 8360 Court Place, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: Daryl Paunil, Howard County Department of Public Works

Background & Scope of Work: The Applicant proposes to install two new crosswalks and replace one existing crosswalk around the Courthouse. A new crosswalk will be added at the main parking lot for the Courthouse and the other new crosswalk will connect the top of the new staircase for Parking Lot E across Court Avenue to Court Place. The existing crosswalk directly in front of the Courthouse entrance currently has small dark brown 6 by 6 inch pavers that are cracked and popping off the road and need replacement will be replaced.

The crosswalks will be Traffic PatternsXD TrafficScapes product by Ennis-Flint. The material is a durable thermoplastic pavement that is heated and embedded into the top layer of asphalt. There are various combinations of patterns, borders and colors; British Cobble was chosen to resemble a square cobblestone pattern. The stamped portion of the crosswalks will be 8 feet wide. The crosswalk will contain a 6 inch white reflective strip (not included in the 8 foot width) and an 8 inch stamped brick border in light gray. The 8 inch stamped brick border will be on both sides of the crosswalk. The interior of the crosswalk will be a dark gray, called field gray.

Staff Comments: Chapter 10.A (page 74) of the Guidelines explains, "a variety of paving materials can be used alternatives to asphalt or concrete. The brick sidewalks and crosswalks used along portions of Main Street blend well with the mix of historic building materials. Granite pavers or stone walks would be in keeping with the early Ellicott's Mills period of the historic district's growth...Use of materials such as these for plazas, parking areas, driveways or walkways will help to provide an appropriate public environment for the historic district. The stamped asphalt will look like pavers, but be less maintenance. The stamped asphalt complies with Chapter 10.A (page 74) recommendations, "for plazas, driveways, parking lots, walkways or other paved areas, use stone or stone-like materials as alternatives to asphalt or concrete where practical." Although the material is thermoplastic, the stamping and top layer of color will make it look stone-like, rather than typical thermoplastic products. The gray colors chosen will be the best colors for the Courthouse area, which contains a lot of gray granite. Introducing a new color, such as a red brick crosswalk is not recommended.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Mr. Daryl Paunil of the Howard County Department of Public Works, Bureau of Facilities.

Mr. Hauser asked if red brick was used along Main Street. Ms. Holmes stated that there are no red brick pavers in Ellicott City, only a typical thermoplastic crosswalk at Ellicott Mills. She explained there was

another crosswalk by tourism that appeared to be retrofitted over the years and painted.

Mr. Paunil explained the proposed product is a thermal plastic with depth to look like red brick or cobblestone. Mr. Paunil presented the Commission with photographs showing the actual finished product. Ms. Tennor asked if the color would be grey.

Ms. Burgess presented the Commission with a sample of the product stated that the “sugary edge” would not exist once the product is applied, however that it would be skid resistant. Mr. Hauser inquired about the installation process. Mr. Paunil explained the installation process to the Commission.

Ms. Tennor asked if existing pavers and concrete would be removed from the existing crosswalk. Mr. Paunil explained that the existing surfaces are in disrepair and would be repaired with concrete and the new thermal product. Mr. Hauser said he was fine with the proposed product.

Mr. Shad asked the life expectancy of the product. Mr. Paunil stated that it should be about the same as asphalt, about 10-15 years. Ms. Tennor asked if the area was primarily pedestrian traffic and Mr. Paunil stated that there would be some vehicular traffic. Mr. Paunil explained the sidewalk was being replaced, so there would be a smooth transition. Ms. Holmes asked if the shape of the new crosswalk would be more regular than the existing. Mr. Paunil said it would.

Motion: Mr. Shad moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-51 – 8202 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-68

Paint exterior. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Ronald Peters

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1850. The Applicant proposes to paint the exterior of the building and seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work. The front of the porch and porch ceiling will be painted Benjamin Moore Monterey White (HC-27). The porch floor will be painted dark brown to match the existing. The first floor windows and door trim, 2nd floor door, fascia board and trim around the vents on the front of the porch will be painted Benjamin Moore Cushing Green (HC-125).

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6.N (page 50) recommendations, “use colors appropriate to the period and style of the building” and “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The application is also eligible for historic tax credits per Section 20.112 of the County Code.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Testimony: The Applicant was not present. Ms. Holmes said that she spoke with the Applicant and stated that he would like to amend the application for tax credit pre-approval to include the upper floors windows and cornice, to be painted in-kind. She said the current color was white.

Mr. Hauser confirmed that only two colors will be used on the front. Ms. Holmes said there will be two colors, but the porch floor will match the existing. Mr. Hauser said he wanted the cornice to be the Monterey White.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the application, amending it to also include the mansard roof trim, side windows to be white, cornice repairs painted the same color as rest of the façade and the upper floor windows in the front for tax credits. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Additional Business

Mr. Hauser moved to go into closed session and Ms. Tennor seconded. The Commission went into closed session to obtain legal advice on voting procedures at 8:12 p.m.

Mr. Hauser moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Shad seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 8:17 p.m.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Joseph Hauser, Chairperson

Lisa Kenney, Recording Secretary



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION
ELlicott City Historic District ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov
410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-1655
TDD 410-313-2323

September Minutes

The eighth regular meeting for the year 2014 of the Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, September 4, 2014 in the C. Vernon Gray Room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, Maryland.

Members present: Joseph Hauser, Chairperson; Lisa Badart; Eileen Tennor; and Allan Shad

Members absent: Sam Crozier

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Lewis Taylor, Dan Bennett, and Carol Stirn

Lisa Badart opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules of the meeting. Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the August 7, 2014 minutes. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. 14-30c – 4844 Bonnie Branch Road, Ellicott City, HO-861
2. 14-61 – 3711 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City
3. 14-62 – 8241-8243 Main Street, Ellicott City
4. 14-63 – 8210-8212 Main Street, Ellicott City
5. 14-64 – 8004 Main Street, Ellicott City
6. 14-65 – 8321 Main Street, Ellicott City
7. 14-66 – 8329-8333 Main Street, Ellicott City
8. 14-67 – 8390 Main Street, Ellicott City
9. 14-60 – 8307 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-572
10. 14-68 – 2166 Waterloo Road, Ellicott City, HO-889
11. 14-69 – 8202 Main Street, Ellicott City
12. 14-70 – 8416 Elko Drive, Ellicott City, HO-866
13. 14-71 – 8293 Main Street, Ellicott City
14. 14-72 – 8143 Main Street, Ellicott City

CONSENT AGENDA

14-30c – 4844 Bonnie Branch Road, Ellicott City, HO-861

Final tax credit claim.

Applicant: Donald Startzell

Background & Scope of Work: On June 5, 2014 the Applicant was pre-approved to clean and stain the exterior of the cedar house, and fill in holes as needed. The application states that \$5,035.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$1,258.75 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: There is a \$100 difference between the proposal and cancelled checks (which are the higher amount) paid to the contactor. The owner explained that the extra \$100 went toward additional caulking.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of the tax credit as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-61 –3711 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Don Reuwer

Background & Scope of Work: According to the Historic Sites Inventory form, the building dates to 1926. The Applicant proposes to paint the exterior of the building Benjamin Moore Gunsmith Gray, the trim Prentis Cream and the doors will be Mopboard Black. The window sills on the building will be painted black. The window frames and cornice will be Prentis Cream. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6.N (page50) recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” Only three colors will be used and they are all neutral colors.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-62 –8241-8243 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: William and Brenda Franz

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to paint the exterior of the building and seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement Program funds for the work. The Applicant proposes to paint the first, second floor and 3rd floor mansard roof Benjamin Moore Lampblack (CW-695), a gray color. The shutters will be painted Carter Plum (CW-355) and the windows and soffits and cornice will be Franklin White (CW-200).

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6.N (page 50) recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The building will only be three colors and the plum will be used as an

accent color.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, and availability of funds. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-63 – 8210-8212 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.
Applicant: Charles Alexander

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to paint the 1st, 2nd and 3rd floor windows, doors and top cornice. The windows and cornice will remain white, the front door at 8210 (Pure Wine Café) will remain red. The beadboard door will be changed to gray. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement Program funds for the work.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6.N (page 50) recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” Staff had asked the Applicant if he was interested in painting the white beadboard door gray, as the current white strongly stands out against the granite building. Since the door is not functional, the intent is for it to blend in with the building. Otherwise, the painting of the red and white is considered Routine Maintenance, which Chapter 6.N (page 50) defines as, “painting previously painted surfaces using the same color as the existing paint.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, and availability of funds. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-64 – 8004-8014 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs. Tax Credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.
Applicant: Mike Pascale

Background & Scope of Work: According to the Historic Sites Inventory form, the building dates to approximately 1930. The Applicant proposes to repaint the window frames and door frames white to match the existing. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work and Façade Improvement funds.

Staff Comments: The application is considered Routine Maintenance, which Chapter 6.N (page 50) defines as, “painting previously painted surfaces using the same color as the existing paint.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, and availability of funds and receipt of two bids. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-65 – 8321 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.
Applicant: Miriam C. Eades

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1920. The Applicant proposes to paint the exterior of the building and seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement Program funds for the work. The Applicant proposes to paint the siding Benjamin Moore Jicama, a pale yellow/beige, the doors Red Burgundy and the shutters will remain black. The window trim will remain white. The building is currently red with black shutters and a black door.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6.N (page 50) recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The yellow is very subtle and not bright. The red will be the brightest color and will only be used on the door.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, and availability of funds. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-66 – 8329-8333 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: Rob Brennan

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1920. The Applicant proposes to paint the exterior of the building and seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work. The Applicant proposes to paint the front elevation siding Benjamin Moore Sandy Hook Gray (HC-108), the shutters Branchport Brown (HC-72) and the doors Georgian Green (HC-115). The trim will be white to match the existing.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6.N (page 50) recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The proposed colors are all very neutral. The building currently has a dark teal/green façade and the proposed Sandy Hook Gray color is a darker green taupe, which will make the front and side of the building more compatible.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-67 – 8390 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: Dave Carney

Background & Scope of Work: According to the Historic Sites Inventory form the building dates to 1938-1939. The Applicant proposes to paint the trim on the first floor of the building Benjamin Moore Jojoba, a muted green (AF-460) and the doors Chambourd, a deep purple (AF-645). The ceiling in the recessed entryway would also be painted the green Jojoba.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6.N (page 50) recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The green trim color is a muted olive green. The purple will only be used on the doors.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-69 – 8202 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: Ronald Peters

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1850. The Applicant was approved in July 2014 to paint the building, using new colors. The Applicant now seeks approval to caulk and re-glaze the windows as needed. The windows will remain white. The Applicant will also repair a leak on the roof on the right side of the building. The contractor will roll a leak stopping product on the area and check the caulking. The Applicant has explained:

“There is a ledge at the fifth floor level that comes out about 16 inches from the building. The cornice molding is what supports the ledge. The ledge is covered with a rubber roof coating and acts as the rain gutters for the building. There seems to be a slit in one section of the rubber membrane. When it rains hard, the water in this area runs down behind the cornice molding and enters into the wall below and sometimes seeps into the building; its worse when we have snow build up and heavy rains.”

Staff Comments: Chapter 6.H (page 42) considers the re-glazing of the windows to be routine maintenance, which is defined as “Repairing windows, including replacement or clear glass and putty.” The repair of the roof leak is also considered routine maintenance, which Chapter 6.E (page 32) defines as repairing roofs, including the replacement of small areas of roofing material, using material similar to the existing roofing in dimensions, shape, color and texture.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, and availability of funds. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete. Work cannot begin until a Certificate of Approval and Façade Improvement Program Approval have been received.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

14-60 – 8307 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-572

Paint exterior. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Courtney Kehoe

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1930. The Applicant proposes to paint the exterior of the building a beige color called Sherwin William Dhurrie Beige (SW-7524). The building is currently brown. The red section of the building where La Palapa is located will be painted black. The awning at LaPalapa will be painted black. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6.N (page 50) recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible. In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The proposed beige will make the building brighter and the black will coordinate with the awnings and LaPalapa sign. The painting of the awning is not eligible for tax credits as it is not a historic element on the building. Staff has inquired what the material of the awning is, in order to determine if it is a paintable surface.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted, contingent upon the awning being a paintable surface. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the work excluding the painting of the awning.

Testimony: Ms. Badart swore in Megan Reuwer. Ms. Badart asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Reuwer stated the awning material has been researched and it is a rubberized canvas, which is a paintable material. Ms. Badart confirmed that the item was not eligible for tax credits. Ms. Reuwer stated correct and explained that approval was being sought to paint the awning black with no tax credit and to have tax credit approval for the painting of the building. The Commission had no other comments.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to Approve as submitted, but with no tax credits for painting the awning. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-68 – 2166 Waterloo Road, Ellicott City, HO-889

Advisory Comments for subdivision.

Applicant: R. Jacob Hikmat

Background & Scope of Work: According to the Historic Sites Inventory form the building dates to 1938-1939. The historic house is listed on the Inventory as HO-889, the Lotz House. The Applicant proposes to subdivide the 1.8 acre parcel into three lots and retain the historic house on Lot 3. New lots 1 and 2 will be located behind the historic house and accessed from Horseshoe Road, not Waterloo Road.

Staff Comments: The streetscape from Waterloo Road will remain unchanged, except for the removal of a forested area behind the historic house, for the construction of the new houses. There are a row of mature cedar trees (about 9) lining the proposed driveway to the two new lots. Staff recommends the cedar trees be retained as they are large and will help buffer the new construction. The subdivision will be located behind the historic house, separated by the forested area. Staff recommends the forested area be retained as much as possible, or the setting for the historic homes along Montgomery Road will be disturbed if the new construction becomes visible.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the cedar trees along the proposed driveway be protected and retained. Staff recommends the maximum amount of forest area be retained around the new construction.

Testimony: Ms. Badart swore in Jacob Hikmat. Ms. Badart asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Hikmat stated he is in agreement with the Staff recommendations and has nothing to add. Mr. Hauser clarified with Mr. Hikmat that the cedar trees will be saved. Mr. Hikmat stated that the trees are on the neighboring property, but control can be kept over them so the trees can be maintained. Mr. Hauser asked about the forested area. Mr. Hikmat stated the forested area will be maintained but the area will not be an easement. He said there will be as little

disturbance as possible when creating lots for the homes. Ms. Tennor asked about the line indicating where trees are to be cleared and asked if it was a reliable representation of the tree line around the new homes. Mr. Hikmat stated the line is 80% accurate and should most likely stay as projected, unless it needs to be moved slightly later in the project. The Commission had no other comments.

14-70 – 8416 Elko Drive, Ellicott City, HO-866

Tax credit pre-approval for structural repairs, exterior alterations/repairs.

Applicant: Kristin Magruder

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the house dates to 1910. The Applicant proposes to repair several structural issues, which includes removing and reconstructing the porch, and seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

The application explains:

“The contractor will structurally reinforce the house by reconstructing the sill beam at the front of the house. The sill beam is currently rotted due to age and water damage from improper flashing of the front porch. To remedy this issue, a contractor will remove portions of the front porch and replace and/or fill the sill beam with epoxy to restore structural stability. The front porch will be flashed and reconstructed to original condition.

Due to the sill beam damage, the floor joists now need to be reinforced, as they are no longer properly supported. Contractor will support the floor joists with approximately 18 metal support poles in the basement.

When entering the back portion of the basement, the doorway is being supported with 2x4 pieces of wood, which is insufficient support and causing the wood and floor joists to bow. Contractor will add a steel arch in the doorway to provide adequate support.”

The porch floor contains bluestone tiles, which will be replaced with bluestone tiles that exactly match or the original ones will be reset, depending on whether or not an exact match can be found.

The Applicant also proposes to paint the exterior of the house in the future, although the color has not yet been determined.

Staff Comments: The work as explained appears structural in nature and does not include any interior finishing work. The application is eligible for tax credits as defined in Section 20.112 of the County Code, “work that is necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure with regard to safety, durability, or weatherproofing” and “maintenance of the exterior of the structure, including routine maintenance as defined in Section 16.601 of the County Code.”

The application is consistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards. The work is mostly structural repairs and the porch will be added back on when the structural repairs are complete.

Staff requests the Commission authorize Staff approval for the paint colors, when the Applicant has finalized a color choice.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval as submitted.

Ms. Holmes added a visit was made to the house, and the Applicant allowed Staff to go inside and view the basement. A photo of the basement was passed out to the Commission. There were also written

comments from Ken Short regarding the porch, which were given to the Commission and Applicant.

Testimony: Ms. Badart swore in Adam Magruder. Ms. Badart asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Magruder stated there are two items that he would like to add to the application. He explained that the first item is regarding plans for pest treatment in the basement after the reconstruction of the sill beam is completed. He explained that per the pest report, the log joists have evidence of beetles so the entire basement will be treated for bugs. The second item concerns the back portion of the cellar basement where there is only a screen door separating the basement from the exterior bilco doors. They would like to install a proper exterior door, which will replace the screen door, in order to weatherproof the basement and keep moisture out. Ms. Tennor asked if the extermination of the bugs would also be part of the tax credit. Ms. Holmes stated yes, as the beetle damage is to the beams and it becomes a structural issue. Mr. Hauser asked if the sistering on the joists done with kiln-dried wood, and not treated lumber, will be removed by the contractor. Mr. Magruder stated there are two places where the joists are sistered with two by fours. These sisters will be removed and replaced.

Mr. Hauser asked Mr. Magruder's opinion about the information from Ken Short. Mr. Magruder stated he is not sure about the extent to which the current porch needs to be removed. If the portion is small and can be re-poured with concrete and re-stoned with the bluestone with less effort than having to remove the entire porch, Mr. Magruder would like to have this option kept open. Mr. Magruder would prefer to not have to remove the entire porch and replace it with wood. The contractor needs to be asked about how much of the porch really needs to be removed. Ms. Holmes stated Staff would prefer to not require the Applicant to make a choice one way or the other, but to let Mr. Magruder decide while they see the full extent of the construction needed.

Motion: Mr. Shad moved to Approve the application for tax credits as submitted, including the pest control treatment, the storm door replacement and the option to fix the front porch either way. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

14-71 – 8293 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations and repairs. Tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.
Applicant: Michel Tersiguel

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to paint the exterior of the building, in-kind to match the existing colors. The siding is currently white with black shutters. There is water damage to some of the wood siding, which will be repaired.

The Applicant also proposes to replace the current blue bullnose canvas awnings with new ones to match the existing and add "Tersiguel's" in white to the face of each awning. Staff has requested a drawing of the awning, showing the proposed text.

The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Staff Comments: Painting the building the same colors is considered Routine Maintenance, as defined in Chapter 6.N (page 50), which states Routine Maintenance is "painting previously painted surfaces using the same color as the existing paint." While this work is routine maintenance and does not require a Certificate of Approval, it does require tax credit pre-approval.

Replacing the canvas on the awning with blue canvas to match the exiting is considered Routine Maintenance, as Chapter 6.L (page 48) states that Routine Maintenance is "replacing awnings with new material that exactly matches the existing material." The addition of the text to the awnings is not

considered Routine Maintenance and does require approval. Chapter 6.L (page 48) recommends, “provide a 10-inch to 12-inch valance on awnings. On commercial buildings, use only the awning’s valance for signage.” The awnings are not eligible for tax credits as they are not historic features of the building. Staff is concerned that having ‘Tersiguel’s’ on each awning is too much text for the size and curve of the awning and recommends it be limited to one awning only.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the painting and siding repair. Staff recommends against tax credit pre-approval for the awning replacement. Staff recommends approval of adding ‘Tersiguel’s’ to one awning only.

Testimony: The applicant was not present. Ms. Holmes stated that the Applicant was not able to attend, but emailed Staff and said that they will support the recommendation of Staff. Ms. Tennor stated that placing the name Tersiguel’s on one awning only would be difficult. Mr. Hauser does not feel the name should be on the awnings; it would be difficult to pick one that would look right. Ms. Holmes said Staff was concerned about having the name on the awning before seeing the mock-up, but is no longer concerned as the text is small with a light line weight. The Commission and Staff discussed the awnings and the placement of the name.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve as per Staff recommendations, but to allow the name Tersiguel’s to be placed on all three awnings as long as the name is kept subtle. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-72 – 8143 Main Street, Ellicott City

Install sign.

Applicant: Angelina Brannigan

Background & Scope of Work: The building dates to the mid-1980s and was built after the original building burned in 1984. The Applicant proposes to install a projecting sign from a black powder coated cast aluminum bracket. The sign will read on four lines:

Simply Divine
Boutique
of
Ellicott City

The sign will connect to the bracket with eyehooks and S-hooks. The sign will be routed 1 ½ inch HDU (high density urethane) with v-carved text and border. The sign will be 28 inches high by 36 inches wide for a total of 7.6 square feet. The bracket will be 16 inches high by 40 inches wide.

Staff Comments: There is an existing bracket on the building from the previous tenant. The Applicant would like to lower and replace that bracket. The County Sign Code requires that projecting signs have a minimum clearance of 10 feet above the sidewalk. Staff has no objection to the bracket being lowered, as long as the sign complies with the clearance height.

The drawing provided is in black and white and does not specify where the color will be on the sign. The application indicates the background will be black and that there will be gold metallic and red or silver as accents, but does not specify where. Staff has requested a color rendering of the sign. The drawing also does not indicate if the sign is double-sided. Staff recommends the sign be double-sided, if it is not planned to be. Chapter 11.A recommends, “use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three. Coordinate sign colors with the colors used in the building façade.” Staff requires more information on this item.

The text on the sign complies with Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommendations, “use simple, legible words and graphics” and “keep letters minimum and the message brief and to the point.” The text also complies with Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommendations, “use lettering that is between one-third and one-half of the sign height and covers no more than 75 percent of the face of the sign.”

The sign will be on modern material, but the high density foam is designed to look like wood. Therefore, Staff finds the application complies with Chapter 11.A recommendations, “use historically appropriate materials such as wood or iron for signs and supporting hardware.”

Chapter 11.B of the Guidelines recommends, “use only one projecting or hanging sign per building.” This will be the only sign on the building. The Guidelines also recommend (page 84), “limit the sign area to be in scale with the building. Projecting or hanging signs of four to six square feet are appropriate for many of Ellicott City’s small, attached commercial buildings.” The sign will be slightly larger than the recommended size, but the building is also larger than some of the historic buildings so the scale is still appropriate.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval, contingent upon receiving a color drawing of the sign and appropriate use of colors.

Testimony: The Applicant was not present. Ms. Holmes had made several attempts to contact the Applicant but with no response. The Commission discussed where the different colors might be on the sign. The Commission cannot tell where any of the color references are supposed to be since nothing is really specified in the application. There is not enough information to work with in order to discuss the case. The Applicant needs to be present to give input.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to continue the case until the October meeting so more information can be obtained. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Other Business

Ms. Burgess introduced two observers at the meeting: Drew who will be appointed to replace Lisa Badart, and Brian from Savage who may be a future appointee for the Commission.

Ms. Badart moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Tennor seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 7:39 p.m.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Joseph Hauser, Chairperson

Carol Stirn, Recording Secretary



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
ELlicott CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov
410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-1655
TDD 410-313-2323

October Minutes

The ninth regular meeting for the year 2014 of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, October 2, 2014 in the C. Vernon Gray Room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, Maryland.

Members present: Joseph Hauser, Chairperson; Lisa Badart; and Allan Shad

Members absent: Eileen Tennor

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Lewis Taylor, Dan Bennett, and Carol Stirn

Chairman Hauser opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules of the meeting. Mr. Hauser moved to Approve the September 4, 2014 minutes. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. 13-21c – 6802 Norris Lane, Elkridge, HO-454
2. 14-20c – 8469 Main Street, Ellicott City
3. 14-72 – 8143 Main Street, Ellicott City (continued from September)
4. 14-73 – 8267 Main Street, Ellicott City
5. 14-74 – 8370-8374 Main Street, Ellicott City
6. 14-75 – 8109-8113 Main Street, Ellicott City
7. 14-76 – 8133 Main Street, Ellicott City

CONSENT AGENDA

13-21c – 6802 Norris Lane, Elkridge, HO-454

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Marisa and Mike McCurdy

Background & Scope of Work: On September 12, 2013 the Applicant was pre-approved to make repairs and exterior alterations to the house. The application states that \$65,700.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$16,425.00 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The work complies with that pre-approved and the invoices add up to the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of final tax credit as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-20c – 8469 Main Street, Ellicott City

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Margaret Andrews

Background & Scope of Work: On May 1, 2014 the Applicant was pre-approved to paint the exterior of the house and replace the existing metal gutters. The application states that \$10,500.00 was spent on eligible pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$2,625.00 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The work complies with that pre-approved and the invoices add up to the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends approval of final tax credit as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

14-72 – 8143 Main Street, Ellicott City (continued from September)

Install sign.

Applicant: Angelina Brannigan

Background & Scope of Work: This case has been continued from the September meeting in order to obtain more information on the proposed signs. The building dates to the mid-1980s and was built after the original building burned in 1984. The Applicant proposes to install a projecting sign from a black powder coated cast aluminum bracket. The sign will read on four lines:

Simply Divine
Boutique
of
Ellicott City

The sign will connect to the bracket with eyehooks and S-hooks. The sign will be routed 1 ½ inch HDU (high density urethane) with v-carved text and border. The sign will be 28 inches high by 36 inches wide for a total of 7.6 square feet. The bracket will be 16 inches high by 40 inches wide.

Staff Comments: There is an existing bracket on the building from the previous tenant. The Applicant would like to lower and replace that bracket. The County Sign Code requires that projecting signs have a minimum clearance of 10 feet above the sidewalk. Staff has no objection to the bracket being lowered, as long as the sign complies with the clearance height.

The drawing provided is in black and white and does not specify where the color will be on the sign. The application indicates the background will be black and that there will be gold metallic and red or silver as accents, but does not specify where. Staff has requested a color rendering of the sign. The drawing also does not indicate if the sign is double-sided. Staff recommends the sign be double-sided, if it is not planned to be. Chapter 11.A recommends, “use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than

three. Coordinate sign colors with the colors used in the building façade.” Staff requires more information on this item.

The text on the sign complies with Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommendations, “use simple, legible words and graphics” and “keep letters minimum and the message brief and to the point.” The text also complies with Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommendations, “use lettering that is between one-third and one-half of the sign height and covers no more than 75 percent of the face of the sign.”

The sign will be on modern material, but the high density foam is designed to look like wood. Therefore, Staff finds the application complies with Chapter 11.A recommendations, “use historically appropriate materials such as wood or iron for signs and supporting hardware.”

Chapter 11.B of the Guidelines recommends, “use only one projecting or hanging sign per building.” This will be the only sign on the building. The Guidelines also recommend (page 84), “limit the sign area to be in scale with the building. Projecting or hanging signs of four to six square feet are appropriate for many of Ellicott City’s small, attached commercial buildings.” The sign will be slightly larger than the recommended size, but the building is also larger than some of the historic buildings so the scale is still appropriate.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval, contingent upon receiving a color drawing of the sign and appropriate use of colors.

Testimony: Ms. Holmes stated that she spoke with the Applicant for this case, and the Applicant withdrew the case in order to work on further refining the sign, and she will submit another application at a later date. The Applicant did email the withdrawal in writing to Ms. Holmes.

14-73 – 8267 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: Richard Lee, Howard County Department of Public Works

Background & Scope of Work: The building dates to 1940. The Applicant proposes to replace the existing black metal railings on the staircase and ADA ramp with a more appropriate accessible railing. The Applicant also proposes to replace the existing front lanterns, which are in poor condition. The light posts will remain.

The existing railings are corroded and in poor condition. The Applicant will replace the railings on the stairs and ADA ramp with continuous side rails, which are ADA compliant.

The lanterns will be replaced with two new black metal LED light fixtures. The proposed lanterns will be 44 11/16 inches high by 19 5/16 wide. The lanterns will look very similar to the existing, but will be larger.

Staff Comments: The Guidelines do not specifically address hand railings, but fences are very similar in appearance and the Guidelines are applicable. Chapter 9.D recommends “install open fencing, generally not more than five feet high, of wood or dark metal” and “construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures, particularly for features visible from a public way.” The new railings will be black metal and very similar to the existing rails, but with the addition of the second lower handrail.

The proposed lantern may be too large for the post. However the style of the lantern is very similar to

the existing. A correct sized lantern would comply with Chapter 9.E recommendations, “whenever possible, use a consistent design of light poles and fixtures within a given area of the historic district” and “when new streetlights or parking lot lights are needed, install traditional style, post-top fixture made of dark metal of a materials that resembles dark metal, particularly in highly visible locations.”

There are several other items referenced in the application, such as replacing broken slate pavers, repairing and repainting the door frame and repairing the concrete gutter. However, these items are Routine Maintenance as no changes are being made and do not require approval.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted, contingent upon using a correctly sized lantern top.

Testimony: The Applicant was not present. Ms. Holmes summarized the Staff comments. She explained that one issue is that the initial size for the globes was too large. DPW has now issued two new specs for the globes and is open to the decision made by the Commission. Ms. Holmes stated the new railing will also contain the ADA second rail. Staff and the Commission discussed the proposed work and the size of the globes.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve per Staff recommendations, except the stipulation for the globes will be the 28 inch version. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-74 – 8370-8374 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations and repairs, tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: William F. Bishop

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1920. Due to a miscommunication through the grant from the Ellicott City Historic District Partnership, where this project is being funded from, this building has already been painted. However, it was not the intent of the owner to paint the building the new color prior to receiving a Certificate of Approval or Tax Credit Pre-Approval.

The Applicant proposes to paint the front façade trim, re-stain the front door, replace the exterior light fixture and the building metal address numbers. The Applicant proposed to paint the trim a dark sage green called Benjamin Moore Lush (AF-475) to match the color on 8370 Main Street and the roof. There were two shades of green on the building; 8370 Main Street had a dark sage green color while 8374 Main Street was a light mint green color. The intent of the new color was to maintain the overall general appearance and unify the building with one color.

The application states that the light fixture will be replaced with a new copper fixture, as the existing fixture is in poor condition. However, the Applicant informed Staff that has decided to paint the existing fixture black. New address number will be added to the front door to read ‘8370-8374.’ The proposed address numbers will be cast brass with an antique brass finish.

The application also indicates that the gutters will be replaced, but the Applicant has decided just to paint them the new color instead. The front door will be re-stained to match the existing.

The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval and Façade Improvement Program funds for the work.

Staff Comments: The new paint color is very similar to the previous colors, but is a richer shade of

green. The color complies with Chapter 6.N recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings...In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” The new green is also similar to a color approved last month for the neighboring building.

If the Applicant decides to use a new light, it complies with Chapter 9.E recommendations, “place attached lighting fixtures in traditional locations next to or over a door.” However, painting the light black complies with Chapter 9.E (page 71) recommendations, “use dark metal or a similar material.” The antique brass finish for the address numbers will be compatible with the aged copper finish of the exterior light.

The painting of the front façade of the building is mainly being paid for by a grant from the Ellicott City Historic District Partnership. Due to a miscommunication, the building has already been painted the new color. This property is no longer eligible for the tax credit for painting, as the tax credit does require pre-approval from the Commission, per the County code.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for the painting of the existing lantern or a replacement lantern, new address numbers and staining of the front door.

Façade Improvement Program: Staff will approve the application for the Façade Improvement Program based on the approval from the Historic District Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust, and availability of funds and receipt of two bids for each scope of work. If approved, Staff will issue a pre-approval letter explaining the amount approved. The pre-approval is contingent upon a final approval when the work is complete.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Gilbert Bishop. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Bishop stated the comments were fairly accurate; he said he had no additional comments. Mr. Hauser asked if Mr. Bishop had any comments regarding the application. Mr. Bishop stated there was some confusion on obtaining additional State funding. Mr. Bishop said that he is representing his father, William Bishop.

Mr. Bishop stated the façade was already painted, but would like to continue painting the remainder of the building and receive the benefits. Mr. Bishop asked if there was a timeframe to get it completed. Ms. Burgess stated tax credits were applied for on the façade, but not the entire building. Mr. Hauser said that tax credits could be given for an expanded project, but that a new application would need to be submitted for the next meeting. Ms. Burgess commented that if the entire building had been included in the present application, then the painting could have continued. Mr. Bishop asked if two state licensed contractors are still required for the new application. Ms. Holmes stated that two bids are not required for tax credits, but is only required for the Façade Improvement Program, but that the contractors do have to be licensed. Ms. Badart asked if the application needs to stipulate that it does not include the façade. Ms. Holmes said that was correct, that the scope of work must state that the front of the building is not included. Mr. Bishop asked about the tax credits for the new application and if it would apply to year 2015. Ms. Holmes stated the work needs to be completed and brought back for final approval. She explained that if the information is brought back before May for final approval, tax credits will be applied in July of 2015. Mr. Hauser explained that a payment verification must be shown and submitted with the final tax credit application. The contractor must be licensed in order to receive tax credits.

Mr. Taylor clarified that the present application included retroactive approval for the painting, which was done inadvertently without knowing the process, but not for tax credits. Staff agreed that was

correct.

Motion: Ms. Badart moved to Approve as per Staff recommendations. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

14-75 – 8109-8113 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations and repairs, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Travis Johnson

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the buildings date to 1900. The Applicant proposes to make several exterior repairs and alterations to the building and seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work.

8109 Main Street

The Applicant proposes to paint the side of the building visible to Main Street, using the recently painted green and blue colors (Benjamin Moore Seedling AF-450 and Mysterious AF-565) that are on the front façade from the Benjamin Moore project. There is one exterior wall that will remain white, but will be updated with the blue trim. This wall is not visible from the public right-of-way. The back of the building will have all vines and weeds encroaching upon the building removed prior to painting. The Applicant also proposes to repair the roof and flashing around the exterior door.

8113 Main Street

The side of the building that is visible to Main Street will be painted Benjamin Moore Brush Beige and Prussian Blue to match the front façade of the building, which was painted as part of the Benjamin Moore project. The Applicant proposes to replace the existing skylight with a clear double dome skylight.

Staff Comments: Typically this application would be heard in two separate cases as it is two different building facades. However, the buildings are under the same tax account information so the tax credits will be heard as one case.

The painting complies with Chapter 6.N recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings...In general, use calm or subdued colors, reserving bright colors for small, important details, such as doors or trim.” Once the sides of the buildings are painted, the colors will all match and the number of colors used on the buildings will be minimized.

The repairs to the roof and flashing around the exterior alley door would be considered Routine Maintenance, as Chapter 6.E (page 33) defines as, “repairing roofs, including the replacement of small areas of roofing material, using material similar to the existing roofing in dimensions, shape, color and texture.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit approval for all work, except the replacement of the non-historic skylight.

Ms. Holmes gave an update on the roof. The issue with the roof is not exactly routine maintenance. The applicant emailed the roof is a red metal roof and additional roofing will be added to cover a cut-out in the back of the building. The roofing company has been contacted multiple times and has not yet replied.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Jennifer Johnson. Ms. Johnson is the mother of Travis Johnson and one of the owners of the property; she is representing Mr. Johnson at the meeting. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Johnson stated the roofer was finally contacted and she passed out a sample of the roof color, Colonial Red. Ms. Johnson stated she was given information about the vines, the colors, the painting, and the skylight. Ms. Holmes asked for a further explanation of the roof issue. Ms. Johnson said there is a ridge in the back which had water leaking in and that there is a gutter and flashing which will be repaired to match the existing metal roof. Ms. Johnson also passed out pictures of the skylight. The skylight does not leak at this time, but it is old and needs replacing in order to prevent leaks.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted and per Staff recommendations that the skylight is exempt from tax credit pre-approval. Ms. Badart seconded. The motion was approved unanimously.

14-76 – 8133 Main Street, Ellicott City

Retroactive sign approval.

Applicant: Sam Coyne

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1900. The Applicant seeks retroactive approval to install 4 signs on the building, which currently has a zoning violation for the signs. The signs include one projecting sign, two flat mounted signs, and one flat mounted doorplate.

The projecting sign reads on three lines:

){
CRAIG COYNE
You Ware

The projecting sign is 24 inches high by 24 inches wide for a total of 4 square feet. This sign has a black background with gold text and is double sided. The sign is aluminum and hangs from a previously existing black metal bracket.

There are two flat mounted signs, located on the sides of the building, inside wood panels. The signs read vertically “FINE” and “JEWELRY”. The signs have a black background and gold text. Each sign is 48 inches high by 7 inches wide for a total of 2.33 square feet. The signs are also made out of aluminum.

The fourth sign is a small brass doorplate that contains the store hours and days of operation. The sign is 4.5 inches high by 24 inches wide for a total of .75 square feet.

Staff Comments: Chapter 11.B (page 82) recommends against, “two signs where one is sufficient to provide an easily visible identification of the business” and “more than two signs per business per façade.” The Applicant proposes to use four total signs on the front façade, which does not comply with the recommendations. While the doorplate sign containing the business hours does require approval, Staff finds it is too small to consider an actual business sign, but the three remaining signs do not comply. Chapter 11.B (page 81-82) explains, “most buildings should not have more signs than uses or occupants. In a few cases a location may call for two signs for a business. When the two signs are on the same building façade, the best combination will often be one flat-mounted or windows sign and one projecting sign. Multiple signs need to be coordinated so that the cumulative effect does not clutter or obscure the building façade.” While more than one sign may be needed on large buildings, this building is small and is overwhelmed by three signs.

The application does not comply with Chapter 11.A, which recommends (page 80), “emphasize the

identification of the establishment rather than an advertising message on the face of the sign” and “use historically appropriate materials such as wood or iron for signs and supporting hardware.” The ‘FINE’ and ‘JEWELRY’ signs are flat mounted at pedestrian level and stand out as a modern material against the wood paneled storefront. Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommends, “use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three. Coordinate sign colors with the colors used in the building façade.” In an email correspondence earlier this summer, the Applicant indicated the signs were temporary to get through the holidays and later, the Benjamin Moore project. The Applicant had expressed interest in matching the signs to the colors chosen by Benjamin Moore. The ‘FINE JEWELRY’ side signs detract from the building facade. The projecting sign is high and small enough that the different colors and modern material are not as noticeable.

The projecting sign complies with Chapter 11.B recommendations, “in most cases, limit the area of signage to one-half square foot of sign area for each linear foot of primary street frontage, with a limit of eight square feet in area for any one sign.” The projecting sign also complies with Chapter 11.A recommendations, “use simple, legible words and graphics” and “emphasize the identification of the establishment, rather than an advertising message on the face of the sign.”

The brass doorplate sign complies with Chapter 11.A (page 80) recommendations, “use historically appropriate materials for signs, such as wood or iron for signs and supporting hardware.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of the hanging sign and door plate sign with store hours. Staff recommends denial of the ‘Fine Jewelry’ side panel signs.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Sam Coyne. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Coyne referred to the Staff comments that mentioned where there was interest in matching the signs to the Benjamin Moore paint colors. Mr. Coyne stated he did not personally choose the colors used. Mr. Coyne also requested and paid for the second floor of his building to be painted. Mr. Coyne feels the colors do contrast, but does not think they clash. He said it is not an option to not use the logo colors as the corporate image is based on these colors.

Mr. Hauser asked Staff about their comments regarding the three larger signs not complying. Mr. Hauser said that the hanging sign is fine. Ms. Holmes explained that the hanging sign is not as noticeable as the two flat mounted signs, but having three total signs does not comply with the Guidelines. Mr. Coyne stated using the three signs was not a new idea; these sign placements were already on the building from the previous business in the exact same spots. The signs are made to be seen by pedestrians, not traffic. The words ‘Fine Jewelry’ could not be fit onto the hanging sign and still be visible to pedestrians. Ms. Badart stated she finds the hanging sign compatible and has no objections to it. The brass door sign is discrete. Ms. Badart agrees with Staff that the ‘Fine Jewelry’ signs in the panels seem out of character and inconsistent. Mr. Shad had no additional comments on the signs.

Mr. Coyne asked if it would be possible to obtain a variance to make the single hanging sign larger to more correctly identify the business. When the dimensions were given to the sign company for the current sign, the font had to be very small and it was not readable by pedestrians. Ms. Badart asked if the goal is to add ‘Fine Jewelry’ to the hanging sign. Mr. Coyne would like to add those words and maybe a bit more. There are many jewelry stores and adding Fine Jewelry would distinguish the store as a high-end shop, not a bead shop. Ms. Holmes stated the regulations recommend signs to be 4 to 6 square feet so it may be possible to expand the sign and add a bit more black space to the sides as ‘Craig Coyne’ is right up against the sign edge; there is a lot of vertical blank space but not horizontal space. The wording Fine Jewelry could be added below. Mr. Hauser added the sign does not have to be limited to the end of the bracket; it can extend out a bit further. Mr. Hauser swore in Joshua Haupt. Mr. Haupt stated the signs were already hanging before the building was painted. The owner said he was was told

that the paint being selected for the building would correlate with the signs. Ms. Holmes said that she was with Ms. Haley Woods from Benjamin Moore at the time the colors were presented to Mr. Coyne and that he was asked if the colors were ok and there was an option to use any color preferred. Ms. Holmes also stated that adding signs without approval is really the problem, as this could have been avoided. Mr. Coyne commented the colors are not really what he would have chosen, but they do blend in with the area.

Mr. Hauser requested to ask some legal advice and moved to go into closed session, off the record. Ms. Badart seconded. The applicants were asked to leave the room for a short time. The meeting went into closed session to obtain legal advice regarding signage. The meeting went back into session and the Applicants were brought back into the room.

Mr. Hauser asked about the corporate colors. Mr. Coyne stated the color is technically a very dark green. He explained the color is a Pantone color specifically chosen and when seen through a monitor the color appears to be a very dark green, but for magazines, newspaper and print the color shows as black. Ms. Holmes clarified that Staff and the Commission had no objection to the existing projecting sign, or making it larger to add the wording 'Fine Jewelry'. Mr. Coyne said he does not wish to remove the 'Fine Jewelry' as it identifies the business.

Mr. Hauser asked if there was a way to expand the hanging sign to add Fine Jewelry and make it look nice. Mr. Coyne stated yes, but at a high cost which he does not wish to spend. Mr. Hauser explained there is a problem with the look of the signs and with setting the precedent of the four signs. Ms. Badart stated the signs are out of proportion with the building size. She agrees with Staff that there are too many signs. Mr. Coyne asked about making a larger sign which protrudes from the building. Ms. Badart stated the recommended size be 4 to 6 square feet, and adding 50% to the existing 4 square foot size would make it within the recommended sizes. She suggested making the sign wider would give a broader border around the text. Mr. Coyne said he has worked every type scenario to make the sign work with the font size in order to be readable and that would not work.

Ms. Holmes made a suggestion about painting 'Fine Jewelry' in a darker color on top of the lighter panel color. Mr. Coyne stated this has been attempted but the wording cannot be read; the words would need to be outlined in another color to be readable. The Commission discussed different colors. Mr. Hauser suggested removing the blue panels and painting a fine lettering in the black with a fine gold outlining. Mr. Coyne expressed concerned about the durability of the paint.

Mr. Taylor clarified a statement Mr. Coyne said about fonts. Mr. Taylor asked if the wording of 'Craig Coyne' and 'Fine Jewelry' does not look right on the existing sign. Mr. Coyne explained that along with the spacing for each letter there needs to be a space between each word, plus add spacing on either side of the phrase by the border. Mr. Taylor said if the sign is 50% larger there is space for extra characters, so the font size could be made larger. Ms. Badart stated potentially both Craig Coyne and Fine Jewelry could be larger fonts. Mr. Coyne asked that the size of the sign can protrude past the end of the bracket. Both Staff and the Commission discussed different measurements and gave Mr. Coyne the amount in inches the size could protrude out, both as the additional 50% and what the maximum would be. The sign edge needs to be away from the building by six inches to clear the storefront cornice.

Mr. Coyne asked if he would have to come back to the HDC regarding changing the sign. Ms. Burgess stated no, if an agreement is reached now and the set requirements are followed, then Mr. Coyne does not have to return. Mr. Coyne asked if keeping the current sign and removing the Fine Jewelry is still an option. The Commission stated yes. Mr. Coyne stated he would need to obtain quotes on a bigger sign and the installation before a decision is made. Mr. Haupt questioned if something could be worked out for the three signs. Mr. Taylor stated there are legal criteria which the Commission should apply to the

Guidelines. When a case is heard, the criteria are applied. If one business is allowed to have more than what is stated in the Guidelines, then another business is told no, it can be challenged and taken to Court. It is within the Commission's authority to approve keeping the existing sign, but not the two panel signs, or replacing the existing sign with a new sign per specified criteria.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to retroactively Approve the hanging sign and the door sign. The two vertical signs are Denied and must be removed. The hanging sign will be allowed to expand out 50% of the current existing size. The Applicant must obtain an estimate and produce a design for the sign to bring in for Staff to review and give their approval. The Commission does not need to see the design. The new sign can include the wording Fine Jewelry. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Joseph Hauser, Chairperson

Carol Stirn, Recording Secretary



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
ELlicott CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov
410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-1655
TDD 410-313-2323

November Minutes

The tenth regular meeting for the year 2014 of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, November 6, 2014 in the Oella Room at the Roger Carter Community Center, 3000 Milltowne Drive, Ellicott City, Maryland.

Members present: Joseph Hauser, Chairperson; Eileen Tennor; Allan Shad; and Drew Roth

Members absent:

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Lewis Taylor, Dan Bennett, and Carol Stirn

Chairman Hauser opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules of the meeting. Mr. Shad moved to Approve the October 2, 2014 minutes. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. 14-08c – 8180 Main Street, Ellicott City
2. 14-28c – 3723 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City
3. 14-29c – 3630 Church Road, Ellicott City
4. 14-62c – 8241-8243 Main Street, Ellicott City
5. 14-77 – 8069 Main Street, Ellicott City
6. 14-78 – 8020 Main Street, Ellicott City
7. 14-79 – 8374 Court Avenue, Ellicott City
8. 14-80 – 8396 Park Drive, Ellicott City
9. 14-81 – 4472 Ilchester Road, Ellicott City, HO-456
10. 14-82 – 3538 Church Road, Ellicott City

CONSENT AGENDA

14-08c – 8180 Main Street, Ellicott City

Applicant: Enalee Bounds

Background & Scope of Work: On March 6, 2014 the Applicant was pre-approved to replace the shutters on the front and side of the building with new wood shutters and repair or replace the rotten trim on the windows and doors on the 1st and 2nd floor. The application states that \$8,600.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$2,150.00 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The work complies with that pre-approved and the receipts add up to the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of final tax credits as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-28c – 3723 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: David Ennis

Background & Scope of Work: On June 5, 2014 the Applicant was pre-approved to reset the existing granite steps and repoint the garden wall. The application states that \$1,300.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$325.00 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The work complies with that pre-approved and the invoices add up to the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of final credit as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-29c – 3630 Church Road, Ellicott City

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Gary Segal

Background & Scope of Work: On June 5, 2014 the Applicant was pre-approved to repair the damaged slate roof and flashing. The application states that \$3,105.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$776.25 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The work complies with that pre-approved and the invoices add up to the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of final tax credit as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-62c – 8241-8243 Main Street, Ellicott City

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: William and Brenda Franz

Background & Scope of Work: On September 4, 2014 the Applicant was pre-approved to prep and paint

the exterior of the building. During painting, it was discovered there was some rotten wood on the building, which needed to be replaced in order to finish painting. The application states that \$2,120.00 was spent on the work. The Applicant seeks \$530.00 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The rotten wood was not specifically anticipated in the original tax credit pre-approval. However, Staff finds the replacement of the rotten wood to fall under ‘prep work’ as rotten wood cannot be painted.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of final tax credit as submitted, to include the replacement of the rotten wood.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-77 – 8069 Main Street, Ellicott City

Roof repair, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Len Berkowitz

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1890. The Applicant proposes to repair and resurface the existing metal roof with a weather barrier and seeks tax credit pre-approval for the work. The roof will be cleaned, bolts and screws will be tightened and repaired with roof caulking as needed to create a watertight seal. An acrylic roof coating will be applied to the entire roof. The coating will prevent leaks in the roof and reflect the sun’s UV rays, keeping the roof cool. Finally, a roof primer will be applied to the entire roof to complete the work.

Staff Comments: The roof has been coated in the past and requires re-coating now. The metal roof is not visible from the public right of way. The white roof complies with Chapter 6.E (page 31), which states, “generally strong colors should be avoided for visible roofing materials...Neutral grays allow a much wider selection of colors on the lower parts of the building.” The Guidelines do not specifically reference maintenance of metal roofs. However, Staff finds the proposed work to be routine maintenance of the metal roof. The work is eligible for tax credits, per Section 20.112 of the County Code, which defines eligible work as, “Work that is necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure with regard to safety, durability, or weatherproofing.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-78 – 8020 Main Street, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs, tax credit pre-approval. Façade Improvement Program funds.

Applicant: Mark Bean

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1890, although it most likely dates to the mid to late 1920s as the original Patapsco Hotel collapsed and was demolished, then

rebuilt. The Applicant proposes to clean, prep, and repaint the window lintel white to match the existing. The Applicant also proposes to paint the cornice a dark green, to match a neighboring cornice a few buildings over.

Staff Comments: The application explains that the cornice will be painted green across two other properties, in addition to this property. Those buildings will also need to submit an application for Certificate of Approval to paint a new color. However, Staff finds that using the same color will bring consistency to the block. The proposed painting of the window lintels and cornice complies with Chapter 6.N (page 6.N) recommendations, “use colors that are generally compatible with (and do not clash with) the colors used in the district, particularly on neighboring buildings. On attached buildings, use the same colors or a coordinated color scheme whenever possible.” While the green doesn’t completely match the storefront colors, it is not common to view the entire building and the cornice will also be viewed adjacent to the neighboring cornices.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Façade Improvement Program: There are currently no funds remaining in this grant cycle. In the event that funding opens up (if another project falls through), approval will be based on availability of funds, approval from the Historic Preservation Commission and the Maryland Historical Trust.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

14-79 – 8374 Court Avenue, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations/new construction.

Applicant: David Barber

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the main historic house dates to 1897. The Applicant proposes to demolish and replace the existing garage, which was constructed in the 1960s. The Applicant received approval to demolish the garage and construct a new garage in June 2014 in case HDC-14-36. However after some issues arose when the Department of Inspections, Licenses and Permits reviewed the building plans, the Applicant has decided to modify the new building. The Applicant proposes to use the same materials as approved in June 2014, with the only modification being a Boral poly ash siding in place of HardiePlank. The Boral poly ash siding is “comprised of coal combustion products (fly ash) and a proprietary polymer blend, and boasts a high level of sustainability with a minimum of 70 percent recycled content. Suitable for ground contact, Boral TruExterior™ Siding is highly resistant to moisture and can be installed using traditional woodworking tools and methods and there is no need for back priming, or to prime or seal end cuts” (Boralamerica.com).

The garage will remain very similar to the original submittal; it will have a hipped roof, will be painted to match the historic home and use the same roof shingles as the historic home. The garage doors will be a 12 foot roll up door and one sliding barn style door. There will be brass or copper exterior sconces placed at the door locations and these will be the same as previously submitted.

The new garage will be a one story structure, and will no longer have any usable space in the basement level. There will be one 2:2 window on the south elevation. The south elevation will also have a visible stone foundation line. The west elevation will only consist of siding and the stone foundation. The north elevation will contain two separate roll up garage doors. The east elevation will have one sliding barn door in the center and an entry door on the left.

Staff Comments: This application is very similar to the one approved in June 2014. The construction of the new garage complies with Chapter 7.C (page 55) recommendations, such as “if allowed by the size and shape of the property, place new outbuildings to the side or rear of the main building, separated from the main building by a substantial setback” and “design outbuildings visible from a public way to be compatible in scale, form and detailing with historic structures and outbuildings in the neighborhood.” The materials will all be the same as previously approved, which comply with the Guidelines. The only possible change in material is from a HardiePlank to the Boral poly ash siding. Staff finds the Boral ash siding is very similar to the HardiePlank, and finds that it complies with Chapter 7.C (page 55) recommendations, “use materials compatible with the main building on the lot or with historic outbuildings in the immediate neighborhood.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in David Barber. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Barber stated all information which was previously submitted will remain ‘as is’, except there will only be one level instead of two. Mr. Barber would like to have the Boral siding approved as an option to use and explained they have still not decided if they want to use HardiePlank or the Boral lap siding. Mr. Shad asked if the type of Boral lap siding been selected yet. Mr. Barber stated no selection was made, but the intent is to match the German lap siding currently on the house. Mr. Shad stated the Dutch lap siding would be best. The siding which best matches the German lap siding will be chosen. Ms. Tennor asked about the stone foundation. Mr. Barber stated any exposed area as was stated in the original design will be clad in stone.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as per Staff recommendations, giving the Applicant the option to use the previously approved siding or the new Boral siding in the Dutch lap. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-80 – 8396 Park Drive, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations and repairs. Tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Tarpley M. Long

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1899. The application indicates the Applicant and architect think the house more likely dates to 1930s, which based on the historic use of this land, seems more accurate. The Applicant proposes to make the following exterior alterations and repairs:

- 1) Remove existing pressure treated deck on back of house and add screened porch/deck. The new decking material will be a silver/gray Azek. The deck will have a cable railing. Ceiling fans will be added inside the screened porch and will be an aged bronze color. The screened porch will have decorative wooden balusters.
- 2) Replace two vinyl windows on the front of the house and replace with wood windows and paint cream to match existing.
- 3) Replace front doors and side door and paint cream to match existing color.
- 4) Replace the current brown asphalt shingle roof with a gray asphalt shingle roof.
- 5) Replace asphalt shingles from garage roof and replace with ‘Rustic Red’ metal roof.

- 6) Remove skylights on front of house and add three skylights to the back of the house.
- 7) Add 2:2 casement window to the second floor side of the house next to the chimney.
- 8) Add wall mount bronze can lights to the screened porch.

The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for painting the windows and doors, replacing the roof, and the construction of the screened-in porch for the porch balusters, porch and deck foundation, post and beam construction.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6 recommendations for the Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings. The removal of the pressure treated deck and replacement with a new screened-in porch and deck is consistent with Chapter 7.B (page 54) recommendations, “design new porches and decks to be simple, compatible in design with the existing building and in scale with the existing building in size and roof height.” The porch and deck will remain on the rear of the building, which Chapter 7 recommends, “decks should not be added to a historic building’s primary façade or a façade highly visible from a public way.” The Applicant proposes to use Azek as the material for the new porch decking, with wood and cable railings on the deck. While the Guidelines recommend using stained or painted wood, the porch and deck will not be highly visible from the road. Chapter 7.B recommends, “on historic buildings, construct porches of painted wood rather than poured concrete, metal or unpainted wood. Use stained or unpainted wood only for less visible features of a new porch, such as the decking and step treads, or for simple decks (with railings but no walls or roof) on the rear of the building in a location not facing or highly visible from a public way.” Azek decking has been previously approved for use in the historic districts and Staff finds it will resemble painted wood. The lighting fixtures comply with Chapter 9.E recommendations, “choose and locate lighting fixtures to be visually unobtrusive. Use dark metal or a similar material” and “place attached lighting fixtures in traditional locations next to or over a door.” The lights will be bronze, a dark metal and located near doors in the screened porch area. The ceiling fans are not referenced in the Guidelines, but will be located within the screened porch and is a common feature on porches. Staff has no objection to the ceiling fans.

The screened porch will have decorative wooden balusters. The deck will have traditional deck railings, with metal cable. While the metal cable is modern, it will also not be highly visible from a distance, so if there is any visibility from the public right-of-way, only wood will be visible.

The replacement of the vinyl windows with wood windows complies with Chapter 6.H (page 40) recommendations, “replace inappropriate modern windows with windows of appropriate style. If documentary evidence of the original windows is available, choose new windows similar to the original. Otherwise, select windows appropriate to the period and style of the building.” The replacement of the doors is also consistent with Chapter 6.G (page 37) recommendations, “replace inappropriate modern doors with doors of an appropriate style. If documentary evidence of the original door is available, choose a new door similar to the original. Otherwise, use a door appropriate to the period and style of the building.”

The replacement of the brown asphalt shingle roof with a gray asphalt shingle roof complies with Chapter 6.E (page 31), which states, “Colorful roofs draw attention away from the more important building features. Neutral grays allow a much wider selection of colors on the lower parts of the building.” The removal of the skylights on the front of the building and the addition of skylights on the rear of the building also complies with Chapter 6.E (page 32) recommendations, “add skylights or roof vents only on roof surfaces not visible from a public way.” The Applicant also proposes to replace the asphalt shingles from the garage roof and replace it with a metal roof, in the color ‘Rustic Red’. The roof is not highly visible from the street as there is a very low pitch on the roof. The color of the roof will be compatible with the color of the siding.

The removal of the deck and addition of the new screened porch and deck is not eligible for tax credits, per Section 20.112 of the County Code as it is new construction. However, the replacement of the roof, replacement windows and doors (not to include the skylights or new casement window), and the painting of the doors and windows are eligible for the tax credit.

The Applicant has also stated in an email to Staff that there are structural issues with the foundation. The contractor has provided the following description of the problem, "The reason for the structural repair is the geo pressure (side pressure) being applied to this side of your home. Due to the construction technique that was available when your home was originally built, you have hollow core masonry units. Over time, this sideward pressure has created a deterioration including cracks and bulging to this side wall." The Applicant's architect has explained that the structural engineer is proposing, "to reinforce the existing exterior basement wall with a new concrete wall next to it on the inside, with new interior footings. This work will be accessed through the existing garage. It is not underpinning." The architect has also explained there will be no exterior work or excavation work; the exterior of the house will not be disturbed by this repair. This work is eligible for tax credits as explained in Section 20.112 of the County Code, which states that eligible work includes, "work that is necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure with regard to safety, durability, or weatherproofing."

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for all items except the removal of the deck and the construction of the new screened porch and deck and related items. Ms. Holmes amended the recommendations to include the skylights and new casement window as not being eligible for tax credits.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Tarpley Long. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Long stated she received an email regarding the garage roof, from the contractor who will be doing the house restoration. The contractor stated even though metal was initially recommended to be used for the garage roof, he said it may be possible to now use asphalt roofing on the garage, which would then be the same material that will be used on the main house. Ms. Long wanted to use the same roofing material on both the house and the garage to make them uniform. Landmark Certaineed Cobblestone Grey will be used. Ms. Holmes asked if the pitch of the roof will be changed. Ms. Long stated there was concern about the roof pitch and if leaks would occur with asphalt shingle, but according to the contractor there should be no problem and no change in pitch will be needed. There is a steeper pitch on the back of the roof that should help with drainage.

Ms. Tennor wanted to clarify the two elevation drawings, one drawing had a porch and the other drawing did not have a porch. Ms. Long explained that one is an interior elevation and the other is the screening of the porch. Ms. Tennor asked if any changes would be done to the elevations surrounding the house. Ms. Long said that only the deck is being removed and replaced with a new deck. Mr. Shad had no questions, but did have a concern about the back porch addition and the way the roof slopes into the other roof. He said it is one level and does not appear to be draining in one direction or another. Ms. Long stated there will be a 'cricket' on the roof.

Mr. Hauser asked about the colors of the new house. Ms. Long stated the colors will be kept the same. Mr. Hauser asked if the screened porch will have the same color. Ms. Long stated the porch will be the same color as the springhouse. The gray roof will help unite both the porch and the springhouse.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to Approve as submitted, with the modification of the roof material on the garage to be the same as the roofing on the house. In addition, the skylights and new casement window are not eligible for tax credits. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-81 – 4472 Ilchester Road, Ellicott City, HO-456

Advisory Comments for Subdivision

Applicant: Stephanie Tuite

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the house dates to 1866. The house is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-456, the Fislage-Cavey House. The Applicant proposes to subdivide the 8.19 acre property into 10 total lots. There will be 6 new buildable lots, with the barn to be saved on a 7th buildable lot and the historic house on a 9th buildable lot. Open space will be located on two lots. This project originally came before the Commission in September 2013 for Advisory Comments. At that time, the project only consisted of 6 new buildable lots, a lot for the historic house and two open space lots. The Applicant has since reduced the number of lots of the east side of the property from three lots to two lots, but overall increased the number of buildable lots by retaining the barn on one lot and adding two new lots.

Lots 1 and 2 have been created since this plan was first presented to the Commission, through zoning variances. The barn, which was previously proposed to be demolished, will remain on Lot 4 and be renovated to become a habitable structure.

Staff Comments: The two lots on the east side of the property will be larger lots than when three lots were proposed. However, reducing to two lots will not provide any additional setback or buffering from the neighboring property at 4450 Ilchester Road. A grove of spruces and white pines will be removed for Lot 8 to be constructed. If possible, Staff recommends shifting these two lots over in a north and south alignment rotating both lots 45 degrees clockwise to allow Lot 8 to become more of the buffer and open space area. This would allow the new houses more of a buffer from the adjacent property. A structure built on Lot 8 would sit about 24 feet higher than the neighboring property. Additional open space would also allow for more room for storm water management so that the storm water does not flow directly into the neighboring property. Native evergreen trees would provide a good screen between the two properties.

Staff originally recommended the barn be retained and reused, but if that was not desired by the Applicant, that it should be deconstructed and the material sent to a salvage store. While Staff is glad to see the barn is to remain, Staff is concerned of the practical use of the barn and the stone retaining wall removal. Staff recommends Lot 4 and 5 be combined so that there is room for an addition to be constructed on the barn, if desired, to make a larger building footprint.

Staff recommendation: Staff recommends rotating Lot 7 and 8 to preserve the existing evergreen buffer, and creating more open space between the subject property and the neighboring property. Staff also recommends a native evergreen buffer be planted between the two properties. Staff is concerned of the practical use of the barn being converted into a house on a small lot and with Lot 5 behind it.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser stated that this case is for advisory comments only. Mr. Hauser swore in Stephanie Tuite and Eva Nelson. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Tuite stated a meeting was held last year with representatives from DPZ [Marsha McLaughlin, Kent Sheubrooks, Beth Burgess and Samantha Holmes] to discuss the options for changing the layout and to incorporate some of the recommendations given by the Commission and Staff at the September 2013 HPC meeting. Ms. Tuite explained that one of the suggestions was to obtain a variance to shift the lots in order to have a more usable, buildable area in the steep slope area on the south side of the property. The variance was approved; another community meeting was held; and a new plan was submitted to DPZ Staff for this current meeting. The Applicant met with Staff just prior to the November 6th HPC meeting and there were some minor changes to the plan, which resulted in the updated plan

which the Commission has. The houses on Lots 7 and 8 have been re-oriented, rather than the lot shape, which gives more distance between the house on Lot 8 and the adjacent property's house. Lot 8 sits on a berm and the plan was to cut the berm down as it was man-made, which would give a more level lot and decrease some of the steep slopes on the property. The lots on the other side have been slightly shifted in order to keep the existing driveway as is and widen the driveway to the required 16 feet. There may need to be some altering over time with the drive to gain more front yard for Lot 3. The other main change is the driveway for Lot 3 will be shifted and a portion of the barn will need to be removed in order to put the driveway over to the property line.

Mr. Hauser has concerns about someone purchasing Lot 2 to live on and having traffic from Lot 3 and Lot 5 being close to their home. Mr. Hauser asked what the reasoning was for the existing driveway location. Ms. Tuite stated some of the reasoning is because of the slope of the road. This section of Ilchester Road before and after the bend in the road is pretty steep, so the further down the road becomes steeper; coming off of the current angle allows more distance to level out the slope. The decision was to keep this section of driveway and shift other items around. Mr. Hauser asked about the retention of trees along Ilchester Road. Ms. Tuite said the plan is to retain the majority of the existing trees, except for where the driveway realignment will occur down on the lower side. There will only be one tree along the property frontage which will need to be removed. Mr. Hauser asked about the drainage. Ms. Tuite stated most drainage comes from the ridge line around the area of the barn and existing house, and mainly drains down Ilchester Road. The drainage will remain in the same pattern as it is now and that the installation of dry wells or bio-retention will be required.

Ms. Tennor asked if the new alignment is to try and retain the original configuration of the drive and follow the original line. Ms. Tuite said yes, until the older driveway becomes more of a horseshoe shape. One reason for switching it back is partly due to site distance, but the lower portion of the driveway is very steep so the change is to get the drive a bit further up the road to decrease the slope. Ms. Tennor clarified that the other part of the horseshoe is not being retained in order to mitigate the slope. Ms. Tuite stated correct. Ms. Tennor pointed out there is a small awkward strip between two drives and asked if there was a way to relocate the drive going to the barn to improve the relationship of the two drives of Lots 4 and 5. Ms. Tuite stated this was the existing drive, but changing the location is not impossible. Ms. Tennor discussed relocating the driveway for the barn to the rear of the lot. Ms. Tuite stated the intent was to leave the majority of the driveway as it was, but it is possible to tie the two drives together.

Mr. Roth asked if the barn was to be turned into a residence. Ms. Tuite stated yes, that is the intent. Mr. Roth questioned if it would be practical for a person to live there. Ms. Tuite could not speak to the renovation of the barn, which is outside her scope of work. Mr. Roth is concerned that the barn would not be a desirable place to live, with a driveway to Lot 5 behind the barn's lot (lot 4) immediately adjacent to it. Ms. Burgess stated that Lot 5 is a premium lot, and Staff recommended at the meeting last year that Lot 4, containing the barn, be kept. There is also the driveway issue for accessibility. The attempt is being made to accommodate all issues and needs. Ms. Tennor feels that the barn could still be developed, even though the driveway is close. The barn is salvageable and worth saving. Ms. Tennor commented that the driveway could come off the other side of the barn and not have a connection; eliminate the small stub of driveway between the barn and loop road and tie both together. Mr. Roth asked about the issue of the original location of the driveway to Lot 5. Ms. Tuite stated there was a suggestion the drive was too close to the existing structure on Lot 6. Ms. Tuite will look into the suggestion of changing the driveway for the barn. Ms. Tennor stated she previously did not see a reason to have access to the structure on Lot 2 connected by a piece of driveway if there is access to Ilchester Road, as Lot 1 does. She did say that if the road is connecting Lot 5 and Lot 3, it is more of a loop so it does make more sense.

Mr. Hauser asked if there was any public comment on this case. There was none. The Commission had no additional comments.

14-82 – 3538 Church Road, Ellicott City

Advisory Comments for Subdivision.

Applicant: Stephanie Tuite

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the principal building dates to 1937. There are three other structures on the property, including a small cottage house, a shed and a barn. The property is 8.5 acres. This plan was first presented to the Commission for Advisory Comments in April 2013. At that time the plan was to demolish all existing structures on site and create a 15 lot subdivision, with 14 buildable lots and 1 open space lot. That plan called for 9 houses fronting Church Road, with a total of 11 curb cuts on the road to serve flag lots as well. The Commission did not find the site plan in-keeping with the historic district and neighborhood. A later version of the plan had shared driveways to cut back on the curb cuts on to Church Road.

Over the course of several months, the community has met with the engineers and developers to work toward a more appropriate site plan. This is the plan that was submitted for this latest round of Advisory Comments, with some minor engineering changes. The current plan contains 13 buildable lots, with 3 open space lots. There will be one main road, directly across from Deanwood Avenue, that will be a public road in order to handle trash and recycling pickup, in order to keep that function off of Church Road. Lot 6 is the only lot that will have a driveway with access from Church Road, but it is on the northwest side of the site (past Deanwood Avenue, just before Park Drive) and will not be highly noticeable. There will be six houses on Church Road; the rest will be accessed off of shared driveways.

Staff Comments: Staff finds this plan more in keeping with the historic district and that it has addressed several of the community concerns voiced at the last meeting for Advisory Comments. The row of houses lining Church Road is now similar to those found across the street at the Woods of Park Place. Staff recommended the site plan be similar to the Woods of Park Place so that the subdivision reads as one cohesive development.

There is a 75 foot setback shown between Lot 9 and Road A. The setback only needs to be 20 feet from an interior road. Staff recommends reducing the 75 foot setback to a 35 foot setback, shifting the lots with it. That would then provide a setback of 70 feet from the Taylor property line, a neighboring historic residence. If possible, Staff recommends shifting Lot 13 west to provide a greater side setback from the Taylor property line. Staff recommends planting a dense native evergreen buffer along the Taylor/Duffy property line to buffer the historic houses from the new construction.

The Applicant has provided renderings for the future homes. The architecture appears to be compatible with the historic homes in the neighborhood and with The Woods of Park Place subdivision across the street. Staff recommends street trees be planted along Church Road in front of lots 6-11.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends reducing the side setback between Lot 9 and Road A as mentioned above, in order to shift the lots and provide a larger side setback between Lot 11 and the Taylor property line. Staff recommends shifting Lot 13 west to provide a larger setback. Staff recommends planting street trees along Church Road in front of lots 6-11, and planting a native evergreen buffer on the east side of property along the Taylor/Duffy property line.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser swore in Don Taylor, from D W Taylor Associates. Stephanie Tuite was already sworn in. Mr. Hauser asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Taylor stated the only comment would relate to the setbacks, but wanted to explain the design process first.

Mr. Taylor explained to the Commission that Gary Maule has been assisting the design team in meeting with the community through a number of charrettes to develop the process on how to get from where this plan was a year and a half ago to now. Mr. Don Taylor said that they are not seeking approval tonight, but seeking advice which will help get to the next step of the best design for this project. He said the process is the development of a regimen to allow the team to take advantage of community input, especially for new construction projects. Mr. Don Taylor asked the Commission to allow Mr. Maule to give a bit of history of the process which has taken place over the past six months. In addition, Mr. Maule has prepared a workbook showing the history of the community design process.

Mr. Hauser swore in Gary Maule of Church Road. Mr. Maule explained his design philosophy, of looking at the whole project, including the outside area. In June, there was a meeting with the community and the plan was presented. Mr. Maule said that there is a process for bringing the community and the design team together to develop consensus and so he offered at the meeting to facilitate some work sessions between the community, the owner, and the builder. The owner and builder agreed to attend the sessions. There were three meetings held, and the concerns of the community were documented and translated into the plan. Mr. Maule explained that this information is part of the workbook, which was handed out to Staff and the Commission. The process was to try and understand the site, understand the concerns of the community, and translate the information into a plan.

Mr. Hauser asked if there was good participation by the community. Mr. Maule stated that community members did show up and participated. He explained that plans and markers were laid out and discussions were held about various alternatives, which brought out concerns from community members. Mr. Maule said that each meeting brought more consensus on the plan. The last phase took recommendations and incorporated into one plan at a larger scale. He said they also did conceptual grading on the plan to see if it would fit the site. The biggest challenge for the site is the hilly terrain. The topography is a bowl-shaped piece of property which can be developed around the perimeter. There is a stream preservation area in the center of the site. Mr. Maule explained that the original plan shows about half of the site in open space. One of the concerns is if the open space does not reach Church Road, then the community cannot have access and participate in it. The open space goes into a development pod, which brings the park into the development. Besides the open space, the area needs to look like one community and to be compatible with Church Road. Mr. Maule spoke about other areas which could have open space to create a buffer and preserve the roadway. His suggestion was to keep areas of open space and make the lots smaller, not bigger. Mr. Maule asked the Commission to take the workbook and study it, in relation to the plan that was submitted.

Mr. Don Taylor stated the information presented by Mr. Maule was taken to a technical level and applied some of the zoning and engineering standards which are required on the site. The plan which was submitted for this meeting contains this information. The grading on the site was analyzed, which did impact the architecture being proposed. Some rough floor plans have been drafted which are designed to accommodate the site.

Ms. Tennor commented that the units will be focused inward and on Lots 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 the rear of the house will be closest to Church Road but there will be buffered area behind the lots. Mr. Don Taylor stated correct. Ms. Tennor stated there are other developments in the County with the units focused inward, but there are some where there is an open end rear view of the units. She asked if it was possible to handle rear yards with covenants so that there would not be outbuildings or storage sheds between the houses and Church Road, which may defeat the buffering along the road. Mr. Don Taylor agreed, and said that it is planned to have covenants in order to maintain the site as a natural setting. He said the other goal is to extend the architecture to all four sides and not just the traditional façade look. There is no reason why the design quality could not be extended to the sides and rear with symmetry that makes sense; it just takes a little more effort.

Mr. Hauser asked if there were any public who would like to make comments on this application.

Mr. Hauser swore in John Russell. Mr. Russell is the Vice-President of the Woods of Park Place HOA. Mr. Russell stated there is an improvement in the design and layout of this plan. He said that lots 9, 10 and 11 face Church Road and are grouped too close together. Mr. Russell said these lots do not match the Woods of Park Place housing. He finds there is too much of a clustered look. He said there are six homes on the front of Church Road, and the front of the homes should face Church Road, with porches. The front yards should face Church Road as would be traditional. Mr. Russell said on the west side of the entrance road down towards Park Drive there is a grouping of mature healthy trees, and would like to see the majority of those trees retained. Mr. Russell pointed out on the east side of the entrance road, there are three homes with the smallest lots. He also stated that there are traffic issues which will occur with 13 new homes and 26 additional vehicles. The road already has issues with cars, buses and other vehicles.

Mr. Hauser swore in Todd Taylor. Mr. Todd Taylor commented that mostly what has been talked about is land use issues and very little architectural issues. Mr. Todd Taylor stated that he is not familiar with land use issues and has not had the benefit of being able to review the information which has been submitted, Mr. Todd Taylor requested that the 'record' be kept open in order to review the materials and to submit comments. Mr. Hauser responded that these are only advisory comments and no decision is being made. The purpose is for the Commission to hear the direction of the developer, to hear comments from the public, and to offer comments to the Applicant. This application will be coming back. After a short discussion for legal advice, Mr. Hauser asked Mr. Todd Taylor about his experience with the process, as far as being contacted or going to meetings. Mr. Todd Taylor stated there were some neighbors who were not contacted as they were out of state, but the Applicant did have the information for contacting them. He said that no one else has seen the latest plan and information. At the meetings, the Applicant has not agreed that the proposal is what the actual submission will be. There was a lot of back and forth discussion and the neighborhood was not agreeable to the proposal. Mr. Todd Taylor said that he has not heard anything tonight from the Applicant as to whether they will accept the Staff recommendations and what their position is on the recommendations. Mr. Todd Taylor said that Staff did an excellent job evaluating the proposal, but the plan is not at the final decision yet. If the Applicant would be willing to accept the Staff recommendations, Mr. Taylor will waive the request for keeping the record open.

Mr. Hauser commented that Mr. Taylor would have time to input his comments, but the comments that were made tonight can be addressed with the Commission's comments. Ms. Holmes clarified for the Commission that the packet which Mr. Maule handed out is the process which the community worked through, and the plan being discussed is the large plan submitted by Stephanie Tuite.

Mr. Hauser feels this plan is better than the first plan that was submitted. There are some areas which need work and the Staff comments need to be addressed.

Ms. Tennor stated that the driveway from Lot 6 to Church Road is unobtrusive, and one driveway and a shared access road is a vast improvement over the numerous driveways which were originally submitted, but in looking at the plan, found that it makes Lot 6 appear to not be part of the cluster of homes.

There was a question about the trees which are indicated on the plan for varying degrees and liability. Ms. Tuite stated this is based on the environmental consultant's assessment of the condition of the trees. Ms. Tennor clarified that some of the trees are being removed due to their condition and other good trees are being removed because of their location where homes will be built. Ms. Tuite stated yes,

that is correct.

Ms. Tennor asked if Lots 1, 2 and 3 can be created despite the grading issues. Ms. Tuite said they should not be a problem. Ms. Tennor asked if any noticeable change in paving will be done to the extension of Deanwood Avenue. Ms. Tuite stated the road will be asphalt like the private and common driveways. Ms. Tennor asked about a small strip shown on the plan next to the roadway with a green strip in-between. Ms. Tuite stated this will be a sidewalk, and will be the only one. Ms. Tennor asked about the recommendation for buffer planting. Ms. Tuite stated the intent on the side next to Mr. Todd Taylor is to do a gradual berm with landscaping. Ms. Tennor asked if the trees in poor condition will be replaced. Ms. Tuite stated on Church Road there are 3 trees of the 7 total in bad condition. Mr. Don Taylor stated there will be an opportunity to do replanting of trees and there were discussions about replanting with the Maple trees to keep the same rhythm.

Ms. Tennor commented there is a lot of validity in making smaller lots with large buffer areas, and asked the reason for wanting a large buffer area between Lot 9 and Deanwood Road. A comment was made that the lots are smaller than the lots across Church Road and the clustering of the houses is very noticeable. Ms. Tennor asked if it be possible to expand the space between Lots 9, 10 and 11. Mr. Don Taylor stated the premise for the configuration is based on comments that there is connectivity of the open space to Deanwood Road and Church Road. There is a purpose for the open space to bring it up to Church Road. The open space could possibly be reduced and still retain the effectiveness. The houses are oriented based on how they are approached, the topography and how the houses best function on the site.

Mr. Hauser said the theme of Church Road was large houses setback on big lots. This was an issue for the community when the Woods at Park Place was built. Mr. Hauser said that the Woods at Park Place has smaller lots than the historic homes and questioned whether this new development across from it be allowed to also have smaller lots. At the previous meeting, the Commission requested that the plan not have so many lots. Mr. Don Taylor pointed out that the current plan has one less lot than before. This was done to allow manipulation on the lots and he feels the houses do fit comfortably. The proposed houses are also roughly the same square footage as the Deanwood houses. The goal is to create a community as a terminus of Church Road. The community will fit with Deanwood over time; the character of the houses, the materials and textures will be somewhat similar.

Mr. Shad stated that he has the same concerns about the density and how it compares to the Woods at Park Place. He asked about the density comparison between this development and across the road at Woods of Park Place. Ms. Tuite does not know the comparison. Mr. Hauser swore in Gary Segal of Church Road. Mr. Segal stated the Woods at Park Place ended up with 5 ½ buildable acres and 15 lots. Mr. Hauser commented the density would be roughly the same if looking at the space in between, but these houses are closer together so it does not appear to be. Mr. Shad asked when construction would start. Ms. Tuite stated there are still multiple steps before getting to the construction phase; it could be approximately 1 ½ years to the point of site development plan stage. Mr. Shad commented there is another project in Ellicott City which is on hold due to school capacity, which is another limitation that may affect this project. Mr. Shad also has concerns with the traffic and the impact on Church Road and the historic district.

Mr. Roth stated that keeping the natural contour of the land keeps the historic character, and encouraged the Applicant to present the topography of the land as part of the information to the Commission and inquired about what the topography will be when the land is developed. Mr. Roth asked what is the actual elevation of houses relative to the street and how will the land be re-graded to accomplish the elevation. Mr. Don Taylor stated the elevation has been considered but the details are not worked out yet. The houses will sit lower than the street and are consistent with the houses across

the street at Woods of Park Place. Mr. Don Taylor said the houses will sit about 6 to 8 feet below street level. Mr. Roth stated that he would like to see an actual rendering presented of what this will look like with the actual elevation of the house relative to the street and the contour of the land.

Mr. Hauser stated the density is not correct for Church Road. He said there should be fewer lots, which would allow for more separation between Lots 6, 7 and 8 and Lots 9, 10 and 11 which would make the lot sizing and spacing comparable to Deanwood. Mr. Hauser finds the overall proposal is much better than the previous one and that the idea is good. He said that once the houses come in for review, they will be reviewed to make sure the feel of the area stays the same with the architecture. Mr. Hauser agrees with Mr. Roth that the topography should not be altered much with the building. The runoff/retention needs to be reviewed and there should be retention areas. Mr. Hauser finds the driveway at Lot 6 makes the home appear separate from the community. He said that all the houses should look like they are facing Church Road. Mr. Hauser is not as concerned about the houses on Lots 2, 3 and 4, as they will be architecturally considered on all four sides. Mr. Hauser said that replanting should be done along Church Road to maintain the green look and that consideration needs to be given to the size of trees to be replanted.

Lewis Taylor asked Mr. Hauser if the Commission endorses the Staff comments. Mr. Hauser asked each member to give their feedback. Ms. Holmes made a comment that Staff finds that architectural plans A, B and C to be fairly comparable, but does not find plan D to be architecturally in keeping with the rest of the neighborhood and district based on the stone facing.

Ms. Tennor said there should be a diversity of plantings with a mix of understory. Mr. Roth commented on the houses clustered close together and said this makes them look like an island, depending on how the grading and contour of the land ends up. Given the nature of the area, a park-like open environment may be a better choice.

Mr. Hauser asked the Applicant to speak about the spacing of the houses on Church Road, especially Lot 9. He asked if consideration could be given to moving Lot 9 to allow spacing between 9 and 10. Mr. Don Taylor stated, in reference to Mr. Roth's comment, there is a grade change where the entrance road comes in and drops significantly to the east, which is why one of the houses is located where it is due to the grade change. The other point is the open connection, and the goal is to have it retained. Mr. Roth stated the open connection is a nice idea, but asked if the open connection will happen given the contours of the land and the grading. He questioned if the open connection is an achievable goal.

Mr. Hauser stated when the plan comes back there should also be some contour views. Mr. Don Taylor said more detailed topo can be submitted, along with more accurate house positioning to address the comments on where and how the houses face. The open space will also be reviewed. Mr. Hauser also advised to keep the communication open with the community, Gary Segal and Todd Taylor. Mr. Don Taylor stated they are open to another community meeting.

OTHER BUSINESS

Staff requested to have the January meeting canceled as the County will be closed over the Christmas/New Year holiday, and there will be no time to produce staff reports or mail them out. The Commission was in agreement to cancel the January meeting.

Staff stated Mr. Hauser is to be relieved of his duties as Chair, as stipulated by procedure, and to nominate a new Chair. A Vice-Chair and Secretary also need to be nominated. Mr. Hauser nominated Ms. Tennor for Chair. Mr. Shad is nominated for Vice-Chair. Mr. Roth is nominated for Secretary. All the

parties agreed to accept the positions.

Mr. Hauser moved to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Tennor seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Joseph Hauser, Chairperson

Carol Stirn, Recording Secretary



HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION
ELlicott CITY HISTORIC DISTRICT ■ LAWYERS HILL HISTORIC DISTRICT
3430 Courthouse Drive ■ Ellicott City, Maryland 21043

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov
410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-1655
TDD 410-313-2323

December Minutes

The eleventh regular meeting for the year 2014 of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, December 4, 2014 in the Oella Room at the Roger Carter Community Center, 3000 Milltowne Drive, Ellicott City, Maryland.

Members present: Eileen Tennor, Chair; Allan Shad, Vice-Chair; Drew Roth, Secretary; and Joseph Hauser

Members absent: None

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Lewis Taylor, Dan Bennett, and Carol Stirn

Chairperson Tennor opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. with a statement explaining the process and rules for the meeting. Mr. Roth moved to Approve the November 6, 2014 minutes. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

1. 14-65c – 8321 Main Street, Ellicott City
2. 14-51c and 14-69c – 8202 Main Street, Ellicott City
3. 14-83 – 8398 Court Avenue, Ellicott City
4. 14-84 – 3574 Church Road, Ellicott City
5. 14-85 – 3713 Fels Lane, Ellicott City
6. 14-86 – 11621 Scaggsville Road, Fulton
7. 14-87 – 3676 Fels Lane, Ellicott City
8. 14-88 – 8197 Main Street and 3709 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City
9. 14-89 – Fels Lane, Ellicott City (Lot between 3600 and 3596 Fels Lane; map 25, parcel 328)
10. 14-90 – Throughout historic district (Main Street, Old Columbia Pike, Maryland Avenue, Court Avenue, Court Place, Parking Lots A-F, Ellicott City)

CONSENT AGENDA

14-65c – 8321 Main Street, Ellicott City

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Miriam C. Eades

Background & Scope of Work: On September 4, 2014 the Applicant was pre-approved to prep and paint the exterior of the building and replace rotten wood. The application states that \$5,350.00 was spent on work. The Applicant seeks \$1,337.50 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The work complies with that pre-approved and the receipts add up to the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of final tax credit as submitted for \$1,337.50.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-51c and 14-69c – 8202 Main Street, Ellicott City

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Ronald Peters

Background & Scope of Work: On August 7 and September 4 the Applicant was pre-approved to paint the exterior of the building, repair cornice as needed , caulk and reglaze windows as needed, paint upper floor windows and cornice to match existing and repair roof leak on right side of building. The Applicant has submitted documentation that \$15,270.00 was spent on eligible pre-approved work. The Applicant seeks \$3,817.50 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The work complies with that pre-approve and the receipts add up to the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-83 – 8398 Court Avenue, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs/alterations, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: 8398 Court Ave, LLC; Frank Durantaye

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1920. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the following work:

- 1) Paint the wood siding to match the existing color.
- 2) Paint the wood shutters to match the existing color.
- 3) Replace wood shutters as needed due to disrepair, replacing with wood in a style to match the existing.
- 4) Paint windows and doors to match existing color.
- 5) Repoint stone foundation as needed.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6 recommendations for the rehabilitation and maintenance of existing buildings. The painting of the siding, shutters, windows and doors to match the existing color is considered Routine Maintenance, which Chapter 5 (page 23) considers, “painting previously painted surfaces using the same color.” The shutters will be replaced as needed and will match the existing shutters. This work is also considered Routine Maintenance, which Chapter 6.H (page 42) considers: “installing new shutters or blinds that exactly match the existing ones.”

The repointing of the mortar complies with Chapter 6.C recommendations, “maintain or restore granite

buildings, foundations.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Testimony: There was no testimony.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

14-84 – 3574 Church Road, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs/alterations, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Elizabeth M. Walsh

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the house dates to 1911. The application explains that there are foundation problems with the wrap-around porch on the house, and that the tongue and groove decking is also showing signs of damage. The Applicant proposes to replace the deteriorated features with new materials as similar as possible to the existing in material, design and finish. The current porch is constructed of wood painted gray and white. The Applicant proposes to paint the repaired porch to match the existing. The exact repair of the porch is unknown at this time, until the deteriorated pieces are removed to see what is happening underneath. Some of the known problems include:

- 1) The footer under the front entry columns is failing and will be replaced.
- 2) Damaged/rotting framing members and decking will be replaced as necessary to match the existing historic materials (painted wood).

The Applicant has explained that it is possible the entire porch may need to be replaced, if it is in poor condition. If that is the case, the project will most likely not be finished until spring. The Applicant would like to repair and stabilize the porch before winter weather will cause more damage. The Applicant is concerned about the porch roof pulling away from the main house under the weight of snow if the damaged column keeps shifting. The contractor has provided the following explanation:

“The existing footer seems to be possibly failing along with rotten wood under the decking which is causing the sinking. I am not 100 percent sure about the footer, but we will know once we get into it a little more. The framing members will be replaced until there is no more rot and the decking will be a patch/ replace method. To access this we will need to remove the steps and access the space from the left side of the house. We will have a temporary support install for current column and tear the area apart then reinstall the column. The roof will get slightly jacked back up and sat back down on top of new structure. Pending level of damage this project could range 5,000 to 8,000. This assumes only minor repair to decking surface where needed but full replacement of decking will need to occur at some point.”

Staff Comments: The replacement of damaged materials with materials to match the existing as closely as possible complies with Chapter 6.F (page 34) recommendations, “replace deteriorated features with new materials as similar as possible to the original in material, design and finish.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted and tax credit pre-approval for the work.

Testimony: Ms. Tennor swore in Elizabeth Walsh. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Walsh had nothing to add, but stated the main issue is they don't know the extent of the damage until they take the porch apart. At this time, Ms. Walsh wants to make sure the porch is stabilized during the winter season so that it does not collapse under the snow. Ms. Walsh said if it looks like the porch needs to be rebuilt she will return in the spring with a new application. Mr. Hauser clarified that with the current application she will explore the extent of the damage to determine if the whole porch needs to be rebuilt. Ms. Walsh stated yes. Mr. Hauser said they can approve the repairs to the porch tonight, but the application should come back if it is found that the porch needs to be rebuilt. Mr. Hauser asked about the extent of the repairs and confirmed that once the flooring is taken up, the contractor will replace as many structural members that he can, as well as the support columns. Ms. Walsh stated yes and explained there is one column on the side of the entry up the stairs which has a distorted bottom, which is one of the main problems, and will be repaired now. She explained that it is uncertain at this time how much structural damage is pulling away from it. There is also damage to the side porch, which has been blocked off. If this porch needs replacing, it will be blocked off and repaired later as she does not want to do a total rebuild in the winter. Mr. Hauser asked that any work being done now will be in-kind. Ms. Walsh stated yes.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted, and to specify that the Applicant will be allowed to survey the extent of the damage. If the entire porch needs to be replaced, the Applicant will come back before the Commission. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-85 – 3713 Fels Lane, Ellicott City

Exterior repairs/alterations.

Applicant: Bob Linz, Howard County Department of Recreation and Parks

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1932. The Applicant proposes to remove the existing front porch, which is rotted and in very poor condition. The porch will be rebuilt to match the existing. The rebuilding of the porch will include:

- 1) Install new pressure treated double 2x10 floor joists, 16 inches on center. New joist hangers and galvanized fasteners shall be used through the project.
- 2) Install new tongue and groove Perennial 1x3 ¼ decking. Prime all six sides prior to installation. Decking shall be installed with stainless steel flooring nails. Final finish shall be two coats of Duration stain mid gray paint.
- 3) Fabricate new upright posts from Spanish Cedar to match the existing column profile. Prime columns and paint two coats of Duration Georgetown Green.
- 4) All wooden brackets and trim shall match existing and be Spanish Cedar.
- 5) Install new roof joists, band board and header.
- 6) Install Douglas fir skip sheathing to the roof framing.
- 7) Install a black standing seam roof, including felt flashing and trim.
- 8) Install approximately 56 linear feet of 5" half round bronze color aluminum gutters and downspouts.
- 9) Install cedar tongue and groove beaded edge with center v-groove. Prime all ceiling lumber, paint two coats Duration sky blue latex paint.
- 10) Trim out roof and porch deck to match existing. Porch and roof trim shall be Georgetown Green.
- 11) Install new pressure treated stair stringers, 24' on center, paint two coats Duration mid gray paint.
- 12) Install prime western red cedar railings and balusters to match existing on the porch and stairs, with the exception of the v-groove bottom rail. Prime all rails and paint two coats Duration white.
- 13) Install new pressure treated lattice framing. The left and right end panels shall be hinged and

latched for access. Prime and paint two coats Duration mid gray.

The Applicant also proposes to install a temporary steel gate in place of the existing driveway chain to protect the property while renovations are being completed. A historic-looking gate is planned for the future (this will be formally applied for at a later date).

Staff Comments: The rebuilding of the porch complies with Chapter 6.F (page 34) recommendations, “replace deteriorated features with new materials as similar as possible to the original in material, design, and finish” and “replace missing features, such as missing supports or railings, with materials that are appropriate in scale, proportion and style.” The Applicant intends to reconstruct the porch to look exactly like the existing.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: Ms. Tennor swore in Tim Nedzel, Supervisor of Heritage Conservation for Recreation and Parks. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Nedzel stated the demolition needs to be done before winter as the porch will not last through a snowfall. The porch has been braced up, but it is a safety issue. Ms. Tennor asked if the porch will be repaired or replaced. Mr. Nedzel stated the porch will be completely demolished and replaced new with the same material. Mr. Hauser asked if any change in style will be done. Mr. Nedzel stated no. Mr. Hauser asked how soon the demolition will be done as the porch is very dangerous. Mr. Nedzel stated with the approval the demo could be done before Christmas. Mr. Hauser asked about the driveway gate. Mr. Nedzel stated the gate should be replaced to help keep problems out. The proposed gate will be steel and a permanent gate. Ms. Tennor commented that the understanding is a more historic gate is to be installed to replace the current proposed one. Ms. Holmes stated that a more historic gate will be installed in the future, but for now the steel gate is needed to prevent anyone from getting up the drive. Ms. Tennor asked if the gate will be painted black. Mr. Nedzel stated yes. Mr. Roth asked if the gate will be sufficient to keep people out and not be able to drive around it. Mr. Nedzel said yes the gate is sufficient. Lewis Taylor asked the Commission to clarify the notion of a temporary gate. He asked, if this gate is still up in 3 years, is the Commission fine with the same gate being there. Mr. Hauser commented that the house will need to be renovated at some point and the Applicant will need to come back to the Commission; this gate will have to be changed at that point. Ms. Tennor asked if the porch will be replaced in-kind. Mr. Nedzel stated it will be completely replaced in-kind. There will be no changes at all.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to Approve as submitted and recommended by Staff. The temporary gate will be painted black. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-86 – 11621 Scaggsville Road, Fulton

Advisory Comments for subdivision w/ demolition

Applicant: Robert H. Vogel Engineering, Inc.

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the main historic house dates to 1830. The property is not listed on the Historic Sites Inventory, but is historic and is before the Commission for Advisory Comments for the subdivision of the property. The Applicant proposes to demolish the existing historic farmhouse and outbuildings. The property consists of about 91 acres and the development will contain 177 lots.

Staff Comments: The historic farmhouse, which is proposed to be demolished, is located on Lot 7. Staff recommends retaining the historic house on this lot and changing the curve of the road to add a front

setback to the property. Alternatively, a variance could be obtained, if needed, to have a smaller front setback in order to keep the historic house.

The corner location is an ideal location for the historic farmhouse, as the front facing orientation to the street remains and it is not nestled between dense development. The historic farmhouse could be restored and serve as a focal point and entry feature for the neighborhood. The farmhouse could also provide inspiration for the design of the future homes.

The County Architectural Historian, Ken Short, has documented the house and gave the following report:

The Nichols-Wessell Farm apparently began as a tenant farm owned by Rezin H. Snowden and sold to Thomas Nichols in 1855. The earliest house on the property was a two-story log dwelling that survives as the back building of the existing dwelling. Whether Snowden had it built for, or by, his tenant or Nichols built it after purchasing the farm is not known at this time. Nichols must have gotten into financial trouble during the Civil War and in 1871 sold the farm to David Carroll, but continued to rent the land and farm it. After Carroll's death his heirs sold the farm to George H. Wessell in 1890. Wessell was assessed for the front addition to the house in 1896, and added a new barn, which does not survive, in 1899. Wessell's children continued to live here and farm the land into the 1960s, and their grandchildren sold the farm to Lenox Land Corp. in 1968. The house has a center stair hall in the 1890s addition, with one room to either side on both stories, and the log section on the rear serves as a large kitchen wing, with two chambers above. The house retains most of its historic finishes inside, and though it has not been well-maintained in recent decades, it shows no obvious signs of deterioration.

In Mr. Short's research, he also found that there is a deed from Thomas Nichols to David Carroll in 1871 (WWW 31-67) for this farm, of 105 acres, that reserves "an acre where the family grave yard stands which the grantors hereby reserve for themselves and their family with the right of access thereto." The cemetery is not listed on the Cemetery Inventory. Staff has reviewed the aerial photos for evidence of a cemetery and does not see anything on site. However, cemeteries are very difficult to detect in aerial photography, so Staff recommends being aware that they may be a cemetery on site.

This property is not listed on the Historic Sites Inventory, but could be added, making the rehabilitation of the historic house eligible for the County's 25% historic tax credit.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the historic house be retained on Lot 7 and the road moved slightly to allow for a larger front setback. Staff recommends a thorough evaluation of the land to locate the historic cemetery.

Testimony: Ms. Tennor swore in Robert Vogel. Mr. Vogel spoke about the engineering aspects of the project which do affect the feasibility of retaining the historic house. He explained that the old house sits on the knoll, which falls to the rear about 100 feet to the south side of the property. Mr. Vogel said that on the south side of Scaggsville Road, no property like this is on public water and sewer or included in the public service area. According to the regulations of the Planned Service Area, this property and future development of the property must be on public sewer. Public sewer is available up to Scaggsville Road in close proximity to the schools. Mr. Vogel is working with DPW to design a pump station for the lowest portion of the property, but the design must allow bringing as much discharge from the houses as possible to the existing gravity system by the schools and not having it go back to the pump station. In order to make this work, and take into account the historic house at its current elevation, the sewer manholes would have to exceed 26 feet in depth, which Mr. Vogel said is not acceptable to the County Public Works. In order to bring the manhole depths to a reasonable and allowable level of 20 feet, the knoll elevation would have to be cut down by 6 to 8 feet. The manhole depth of 20 feet would allow

easier maintenance if the County needed to go down into the sewer manholes. Mr. Vogel stated for engineering reasons this is why the front of the property is being graded and bringing the knoll down. This is in order to get as much sewage by gravity to the gravity system. Mr. Hauser asked if the pumping station had limitations on the number of houses that can be handled. Mr. Vogel stated pump stations come in two designs. One design would be a smaller, less obtrusive and less substantial pump station which can handle a certain amount of homes. If the threshold is broken, then a larger and more involved pump station would be needed which is a significant cost. This type of pump station is made to handle much heavier volumes of sewage, and there can be concerns with this type of volume and dealing with it. Ms. Tennor asked about adding a series of more pump stations yearly. Mr. Vogel stated currently the smaller pump station is proposed and the cost runs about \$1 million; the County will eventually own this pump station. The larger pump station would probably run three times the cost of the smaller one and would be a more substantial expense for the County to maintain.

Mr. Vogel stated regarding the cemetery there have been conversations with the property owner, and the property owner is not aware of any cemetery on site. Mr. Vogel has walked the site, as well as several environmentalists, and no one has seen a cemetery on-site. Mr. Vogel stated it is important to keep watch for any signs of a cemetery during the process. The area that is proposed to be developed is in the area currently being farmed and reference to cemetery was when the original parcel was larger and has since been subdivided multiple times.

Mr. Hauser questioned why the historic house could not remain on the bluff and the rest of the property graded down. Mr. Vogel stated this idea has been researched and will continue to be looked at. If the house was left, it might look odd as the house would sit up 6 or 7 feet above the new houses.

Ms. Tennor swore in William Erskine, the land use attorney representing the owner and developer. Mr. Erskine passed out a structural engineers report to Staff and the Commission. Mr. Erskine stated the house has been severely neglected for a long time, and once he became aware of the Staff recommendations to retain the historic house, a structural engineer was hired to inspect the house. Mr. Erskine said that a lot of the items stated in the report deal with cosmetic repairs, but there were a number of items which the engineer flagged. The engineer stated the basement is hand-dug, but never had a foundation. The house is basically sitting on an open hole. The open soil has been exposed to humidity and dampness since the 1890s, resulting in raw timber. The report stated that there has been settling and temporary supports which have been installed by various owners. The dirt walls could be close to collapsing, and if they do the entire house may also collapse. The engineer did investigate the possibility of installing underpinning, but due to the condition and the costs this may be impossible to do. Ms. Tennor stated that people were currently living in the house. Mr. Erskine stated there may be a worker staying in the house, but the engineer, Mr. Snyder, recommended that the house is not safe enough for anyone to live in it and should not be. Mr. Hauser stated even though the house is old it should be saved and fixed up, and the attempt should be made. He said that all historic homes need work to renovate them.

Mr. Erskine made the suggestion that if the house is not demolished, it could be relocated to another area and made available for someone to fix up. Dan Bennett suggested the house be moved to another location on the same property. Mr. Hauser stated the house could be lowered onto a foundation to lower the grading. Mr. Erskine stated the idea of relocating on site can be researched, but if not on site, then have the house removed and relocated elsewhere. Ms. Tennor stated from the historic preservation perspective, part of the value is that this historic house is located on this property. This makes the house historically important. The house needs to be preserved and kept as close as possible to its current location. If the house can be temporarily supported or lowered onto a foundation and given a new setting, there is no reason that the house needs to be hauled away and relocated. Mr. Vogel will take all suggestions into consideration, and bring in the people to study the house and see if it can

be moved and if it will survive a move.

Mr. Hauser stated the house should be saved. He said the house should not be moved; it could be lowered and graded around it, but the house needs to stay. Mr. Roth stated the value of the house remaining is larger in its context. An historic house on a lot with a group of modern homes in a development that look completely different is not appealing. The house needs to be saved, but it needs to be placed in a context appropriate for a farmhouse, meaning preserving outbuildings or having more space around the house so it does not look out of place.

Mr. Shad stated he agrees the house needs to be saved. There needs to be more investigation on the condition of the house; it may be not in as poor shape as thought. Houses can be repaired into a better condition.

Ms. Tennor stated the historic house could be a great amenity in the community. As is continually pointed out, the older homes can be an inconvenience as part of development, but tearing down historic homes cannot continue.

Ms. Tennor swore in Darla Avendano. Ms. Avendano agrees with the Commission that the importance of the house is in connection with the land, and needs to be preserved. The context is important as the house sitting on a small lot will not fit with large mansions around it.

The Commission had no further comments.

14-87 – 3676 Fels Lane, Ellicott City

Demolition of existing structure.

Applicant: Thomas P. Carbo, Howard County Housing Commission

Background & Scope of Work: MDAT does have a date for this building; however it is not a historic building, but is located within the Ellicott City Historic District. The Applicant proposes to demolish the former Roger Carter Community Center, re-grade the site and stabilize it with grass seed to allow the site to function as an open space lot.

The Applicant explained that the original plans for the site were to be four quadraplex units designed to look like single family homes. These plans have been previously submitted to the Commission for Advisory Comments. However, the Applicant recently learned that the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance schools tests confirmed that Veteran’s Elementary and Dunloggin Middle schools were over capacity and that the district would be closed to new residential development for the next several years. The Housing Commission explored other options, such as age restricted housing, but they did not prove feasible.

In lieu of any development, the Applicant has drained and covered the pool, to prevent any future environmental nuisances. Aside from proposing to demolish the building, the Applicant will fill in the pool and remove any paved areas to stabilize the site. The site will be graded and seeded to function as an open space lot. The Applicant has indicated that on-going landscaping activities will continue post-site stabilization until redevelopment in the future. The Applicant’s goal is to remove a community eyesore and curtail any undesirable activities.

Staff Comments: Chapter 12.D (page 88) of the Guidelines explains that, “If the Historic District Commission finds that a structure is not historically significant and does not contribute to the character of the historic district, demolition or relocation will be routinely approved. For any demolition or

relocation, the treatment of the site after removal of the structure...must also be approved by the Commission.” Staff finds that the building is not historic and does not contribute to the character of the historic district, but rather negatively impacts the character of the district. Staff finds that seeding the site after demolition and re-grading will be an attractive community feature in lieu of new development.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: Ms. Tennor swore in Tom Carbo, Executive Director of the Howard County Housing Commission. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Carbo stated a general contractor has been engaged to oversee the work. He explained there are some preliminary items to be done before demolition begins. Grading permits need to be obtained and the sub-contractor still needs to be bid out. The goal is to begin about early March 2015. The demolition will take around two months; it should be done by end of April. The basketball area will be used for staging for the equipment. No traffic disruption is expected. The expected contractor hours will be from 7:00 am to 5:00 pm weekdays. Mr. Hauser asked when the building is demolished what will be done to handle the dust; will it be sprayed down in the case of lead or asbestos. Mr. Carbo said there will be environmental testing first to determine what materials may be in the building and how to handle them. Mr. Hauser asked about the amount of fill to be brought back and will it be raised some on the site. Mr. Carbo stated that has not yet been decided and still needs to be planned. Mr. Shad asked if the facility will continue to be used until it is demolished. Mr. Carbo stated that both Police and Fire had been using the building with the agreement to inform the community when they would use the space, but Mr. Carbo has now been informed by both groups there are no other activities planned at the site. Mr. Shad asked about future use of the space. Mr. Carbo stated future use will depend on the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance and when the school districts open up. The APFO is too far out to decide any definite plans for the property. Mr. Hauser asked what happened with the age-restricted option. Mr. Carbo stated the main issue was financing. Due to the type of financing used, and it became too difficult to incorporate senior units in with the other part of the project at Ellicott Terrace. Ms. Tennor asked about maintenance for the property over the next few years. Mr. Carbo stated a landscape contractor will be hired to maintain the property. Ms. Tennor suggested the land be turned into a community garden in the interim of any development.

Mr. Taylor asked if Mr. Carbo knew the age of the buildings on the property. Mr. Carbo said he did not know when it was built, but heard it was the Police Department in the 1950s. Mr. Bennet said the small portion of the structure was the old police station for Ellicott City and that it was a block building. He did not think it would have had any historic value. Mr. Bennet said they demolished everything in the building except for the block walls. Ms. Tennor asked when it was converted; at what point the interior was demolished. Mr. Bennet said addition was put on before Robey ran for County Executive.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-88 – 8197 Main Street and 3709 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City

Exterior alterations.

Applicant: 3330 Rogers Avenue LLC c/o Don Reuwer

Background & Scope of Work: According to the Historic Sites Inventory, the building at 8197 Main Street dates to 1924, as a fire in 1915 burned the previous building. The Applicant proposes the following work:

8197 Main Street

- 1) Add an exterior egress stair at the back of the building with a canopy and concrete block fire wall. The stair, stair supports and railing are to be black metal. The canopy will match the color of the existing roofs. The canopy will have a wood tongue and groove ceiling and the roofing of the canopy will be asphalt shingles or white EPDM to match the roof on the rest of the building.
- 2) Install two storefront doors at the landing at the two upper levels on the rear for the emergency egress staircase. The doors will be installed into the openings for the existing windows and will be clear anodized metal storefront frame with full glass single door.
- 3) Install new front door within existing frame on the front façade. The existing front door has two swinging doors, which will be replaced with a code compliant out swinging 3 foot door with panic bar and side light. The door will be a clear anodized metal storefront single door entrance closely matching the existing style, which is a narrow style storefront.
- 4) Infill basement level windows below floodplain on the rear of the building, which faces the river. Infill with stone to match existing wall.

3709 Old Columbia Pike

- 1) Reverse the swing of the front door on the stone portion of the building.
- 2) Build enclosed egress path and exterior black metal grate deck on the back of the building. The metal grate deck will be a McNICHOLS Aluminum Safe T- Grid TB 940 with ADA spacing in the color clear anodized. The railing will be a steel mesh plate railing. The 'enclosed egress path' addition will be faced in Dryvit in the color 'red clay'.
- 3) Block existing window at the back of the wood section of the building within 10 feet of the egress path. Infill with siding to match the existing wall.

Staff Comments: The current application deals with code compliance issues for fire and safety. The construction of the emergency egress fire rated staircase on the rear of 8197 Main Street is consistent with Chapter 7 recommendations, "attach additions to the side or rear of a historic building to avoid altering the primary façade." By using the existing windows for the new egress doorways, the Applicant is minimizing disturbance to the rear of the building by not cutting in new openings. The rear of the building is a later addition to the main Taylor building. The staircase wall will be a CMU block wall, to match the existing block wall. The new doors will be storefront frame with full glass single door, which is a style consistent with the front door, which complies with Chapter 7.A recommendations, "use doors and simple entrance designs that are compatible with those on the existing building or similar nearby buildings."

The first floor of the building currently has metal storefront windows. The new clear anodized doors will match the existing style, but will be code compliant. The new doors comply with Chapter 6.G recommendations, "when repair is not possible, replace historic doors and entrance features with features of the same size, style and finish." In this case, repair is not possible because the doors need to be code compliant.

Typically the Guidelines recommend restoring window openings that have been filled in, however Staff has no objection to filling in the basement windows on 8197 Main Street as the windows are located below the floodplain, along the river on the rear of the building. It is more beneficial to keep the basement from flooding, than it is for the window openings to remain. The stone used to fill in the windows will match the existing stone on the building, which is consistent with Chapter 6 recommendations to use materials that are the same or similar to the existing.

On the rear of 3709 Old Columbia Pike the Applicant proposes to construct an enclosed egress path to 8197 Main Street. A window within 10 feet of this egress path will be filled in with HardiePlank siding, which was approved for use in this location only in February 2014. A metal deck will also be constructed on the rear of 3709 Old Columbia Pike. The deck will be built with McNICHOLS grating and according to

the website, “the SAFE-T-GRID Grating is commonly used for entrance ramps, treads and walkway entrance grates. Made of aluminum, it is long lasting and corrosion resistant.” While the proposed deck will be constructed with modern materials, it will be located directly over the river and the materials will be more durable than wood. Additionally, the deck will not be visible from the public right-of-way. The use of metal is also consistent with other design features on the building, such as the storefront windows and doors.

The application also mentions installing a new wood door on the front of the building, where a door was previously blocked off. This item was already approved in February 2014.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: Ms. Tennor swore in Megan Reuwer. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Ms. Reuwer stated no. Ms. Holmes stated the only question, in emails with the architect, was regarding the back staircase with the tongue and groove ceiling. The tongue and groove seems to be a lot of design for an emergency egress, and that a metal roof may be more appropriate for this location. Mr. Hauser feels that shingles should be used.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to Approve, with the stipulation that the roofing material will be shingles, and all other items are as submitted. Mr. Hauser seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-89 – Fels Lane, Ellicott City (Lot between 3600 and 3596 Fels Lane; map 25, parcel 328)

Construction of new home.

Applicant: D. Ronald Brasher

Background & Scope of Work: This property does not currently have an address, but is located on Fels Lane between 3600 and 3596 Fels Lane. There are no structures on this property; it is an empty lot. The Applicant proposes to construct a new 2-story single family detached home with a basement on the lot. The house will contain a porch, decks and attached garage. The site development will include the structure, hardscaping, retaining walls and landscaping.

The Applicant proposes to use the following items and materials/colors:

- 1) Siding – HardiePlank 6 inch exposure, smooth siding in the color Sail Cloth; HardieShingle straight edge panel in the color Navajo Beige Roof – Certainteed “Patriot” asphalt composition shingle in the color Driftwood.
- 2) Trim and Soffits – The trim will be a smooth HardieTrim in the color Arctic White and the soffits a vented smooth HardieSoffit panel.
- 3) Chimney and ground level siding– Cypress Ridge stone in a New England drystack pattern.
- 4) Windows – 1:1 Andersen 200 series vinyl clad wood double hung window.
- 5) Doors – Jeld-Wen wood; 9 lite over 2 panels in the color gloss Roycroft Copper Red.
- 6) Lighting – Black metal wall sconce, mounted next to adjacent door.
- 7) Deck and stair railings – Modular vinyl railing systems by Certainteed, oxford route railing system with turned balustrades. The columns will be Certainteed 10 inch non-tapered round column. Decking will be Certainteed vinyl decking in a gray color. The trim will be Azek.
- 8) Tree removal – 3 mature trees will be removed: a diseased chestnut tree at the entry to the site will be removed, a beech tree and a diseased oak tree.

Staff Comments: Chapter 8.A (page 56) states, “The County Code requires the Historic District Commission to be lenient in its evaluation of new buildings, “except where such plans would seriously impair the historic or architectural value of surrounding structures or the surrounding area.” Staff finds

the overall design is compatible with the district and does not find that it will impair the historic or architectural value of the surrounding structures or area. However, Staff finds that some of the building materials could be more appropriate to fit in with the character of the district.

Overall the application complies with Chapter 8.A (page 57) recommendations for new construction, “design new buildings to be compatible with neighboring buildings in bulk, ratio of height to width and the arrangement of door and window openings” and “use a building for or shape compatible with historic buildings that are part of the same streetscape. This is particularly important for new buildings on infill lots where the existing buildings along the street are similar in form.” Staff finds the new house will fit in with the streetscape architecture. There are several styles of houses on Fels Lane and this house will blend in, it will not stand out as different.

Chapter 8.B (page 58) recommends, “use materials common to the historic district, such as wood siding, wood shingles, brick, stone or stucco, and compatible with materials used in the immediate vicinity. Along upper Main Street, upper Church Road and Fels Lane, wood siding is dominant and is most appropriate for new buildings.” The Guidelines also recommends, “where wood siding is used, use painted siding compatible with the forms of traditional siding found in the historic district. Substitute siding materials can be appropriate if they are similar in width, profile and texture to wood siding. The detailed appearance of substitute siding materials is less important for new buildings not visible from a public way.” Staff has no objection to the use of HardiePlank siding, trim and shingles, which does have similarities to wood, especially in texture and density. The color of the siding will fit in with the neighborhood and surrounding buildings, as recommended by Chapter 6.N of the Guidelines.

The asphalt shingle roof complies with Chapter 7.A (page 59) recommendations for new construction, which states, “use roofing materials compatible with materials used elsewhere in the historic district. Asphalt shingles should generally be flat, uniform in color and texture and of an unobtrusive color.”

The proposed 1:1 vinyl clad wood windows comply with the Guidelines, which explain that 1:1 windows are an appropriate style to use. Staff has no objection to the vinyl clad wood windows, which the Commission has approved for use on some historic buildings. Chapter 6.H (page 40) of the Guidelines explains, “Although they are usually appropriate on modern buildings, vinyl windows can be detrimental to a historic streetscape if used on a prominent, highly visible façade of a nonhistoric building close to historic buildings. Wood windows clad with a permanent finish are a good, low maintenance alternative.” The wood doors comply with the Guidelines, which states that “simple paneled doors of wood or wood and glass are usually best.”

The exterior lighting complies with the Guidelines, as the fixture will be located in a traditional location next to a door and will be made of dark metal.

The proposed vinyl shutters do not comply with Chapter 8.B of the Guidelines, which recommends, “shutters, if used, should be operable or appear to be operable, appropriately sizes, and made of painted wood. Metal or plastic shutters are not recommended.” Staff recommends the Applicant use wood shutters.

The design of the porches complies with Chapter 8.B (page 58) recommendations, “in areas where front porches or stoops occur on most buildings facing the same street, incorporate porches or stoops similar in scale to existing designs into new buildings.” However, the house will contain a significant amount of porches and decks, which the Applicant proposes to all be vinyl – including railings, columns and porch flooring. The Commission has approved Azek decking in the past for rear decks, but Azek tends to look like wood decking. For historic houses, the Guidelines recommend, “Construct porches of painted wood rather than poured concrete, metal or unpainted wood.” Staff is concerned about the amount of vinyl

elements being proposed for the porch and decks and finds this item could affect the integrity of the neighboring historic homes. Staff recommends alternative products be looked into, such as wood or Azek, which tends to resemble wood more so than vinyl.

The Applicant proposes to remove three large trees, which is necessary in order to site the house at the proposed location. There are also many scrub trees and other brush that will need to be removed. Staff has requested more information about the proposed landscaping, but the Applicant said they do not have that information yet. Staff has also requested a site plan showing the existing and proposed topography, site plans and drawings of the retaining walls, and information on the materials for the retaining walls. The Applicant said that they will need to have a civil engineer grade this plan out, which has not been done yet. Once the grading and landscape plans have been completed, the plans will need to be approved by the Commission, per the Guidelines. For the future application for a landscape plan, Staff recommends the Applicant refer to the Guidelines, which recommend, "retain mature trees and shrubs. Provide for their replacement when necessary."

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of the new construction as submitted, except for the following items:

- 1) The shutters should be wood.
- 2) The porch and decking material should be further explored, but Staff does not recommend Approval of vinyl.

Testimony: Ms. Tennor swore in Ronald Brasher. Ms. Tennor asked if there were any additions or corrections to the Staff comments. Mr. Brasher stated he agrees with the Staff comments and is willing to consider all recommendations. Mr. Taylor clarified that the Applicant is willing to change the shutters to wood and the porch and decking material will not be vinyl. Mr. Brasher stated correct. Ms. Tennor agrees with Staff and does not like the vinyl, she finds it looks too slick. Mr. Brasher stated it does, but commented that the house is far away from the road and it will not be seen. He said there will be more visibility from Ellicott Mills Drive than from Fels Lane.

Ms. Tennor stated one item that will affect other residents living on the street will be when the driveway comes through. Right now, people are parking in the area which will become the driveway. Mr. Hauser stated this lot is odd shaped. Mr. Hauser commented that access for the driveway will go through the garage of the house to the right. Mr. Brasher corrected that the structure is a shed, and the shed is located on this property. The shed will be removed. Ms. Tennor asked about the removal of the tree that is stabilizing the hillside. Mr. Brasher stated there are three trees to be removed; none of them are in good shape. An arborist will be brought in to study the trees. Mr. Roth asked about the variety of Chestnut tree. Mr. Brasher did not know. Mr. Roth commented that it would be worth finding out if this is a surviving American Chestnut. Mr. Brasher stated a report can be done on the type of tree and have it submitted. Ms. Holmes stated there are certain caliper of trees which need approval to remove, so Staff would need to know this information.

Mr. Hauser commented the owners of new houses usually install white decks and railings. He said that since this house will sit where it will be visible from Ellicott Mills Road and with the location of the house site, it is not necessary to use white. Mr Hauser recommended using a darker color, which will help tone the house down while still giving it elegance. Mr. Hauser expressed concern about the 10 inch diameter columns, which are not commonly seen on Fels Lane, and recommended the size of columns should be reduced to a 6 inch. Mr. Brasher is agreeable to reducing the column size.

Mr. Taylor stated for the record that the Applicant has agreed to amend the application for the first 2 items in the Staff report, and has also agreed to use a darker color rail throughout the façade, and to use 6 inch columns. Mr. Taylor asked the Commission if the deck material and color of the rails should be

submitted to Staff for approval. The Commission said the items should be approved by Staff.

Public Comment

Ms. Tennor swore in Bill Withers. Mr. Withers pointed out if this project is approved, there will be no rear because of the situation with the house, and the house will be more visible from Ellicott Mills Road. Mr. Withers has some steep slopes concerns with retention and stormwater, and this need to be taken into account. The Fels Lane neighborhood is small. There were earlier comments about context and maintaining it. There has been aggressive infill development, and additional proposed infill on Fels Lane by the County. Mr. Withers said that the Commission should consider if context is to be preserved, does new construction belong in the historic district, particularly where there is a small and fragile extension of the district. This is another encroachment on the edge of the district, which is happening more often.

Mr. Roth asked Mr. Withers if he has a basis by which the property owner can be told they cannot build on this property. Mr. Withers stated anyone purchasing a property in the historic district must adhere to very strict regulations before changes and improvements are made. When someone buys in the historic district, they need to keep their eyes open and consider what the ramifications are, or can be, of that designation. Mr. Withers just wanted to have a community voice on record regarding his own concerns. Many people have said there is a lack of integrity in the historic district in keeping the integrity and context.

Darla Avendano stated she owns the house down the creek. Ms. Avendano stated she is ok with the idea of the section being cleared, but her concern is about the creek flooding the area, and asked what type of water control will be used and how will it impact her house down the stream. Mr. Brasher stated there will be minimal grading on site and the hill will not be graded. He said the stream will not be impacted and adherence to the rules and regulations of Planning and Zoning, Public Works, stormwater management and sediment control will be required.

Ms. Tennor commented that the drawing shows there will be buffer planting as well. Ms. Tennor would like to see more natural planting for screening. Mr. Brasher stated hedging may be used. A landscape plan will be submitted for the type of planting the client wants to use. Mr. Hauser asked Mr. Brasher if he is in agreement to replant some type of mature sized trees should any trees be removed. Mr. Brasher stated yes, he agrees. Ms. Holmes asked the Applicant to submit a sample of the stone to be used on the house.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to Approve as submitted and as amended in the record. The Applicant will submit samples of the stone, the decking and the rails to Staff for approval. The Applicant does not need to come back before the Commission with the samples, but does need to appear before the Commission with the grading and planting plans. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

14-90 – Throughout historic district (Main Street, Old Columbia Pike, Maryland Avenue, Court Avenue, Court Place, Parking Lots A-F, Ellicott City

Installation of new trash cans and recycling bins.

Applicant: Steve Lafferty

Background & Scope of Work: The Applicant proposes to install new trash and recycling receptacles in the commercial section of Ellicott City, to include Main Street, Old Columbia Pike, Court Avenue, Court Place, Maryland Avenue and the parking lots. The existing trash cans are in disrepair and frequently used for recycling items. The new bins will provide both trash and recycling storage, whereas the existing bins only hold trash. The current bin locations will be evaluated and new bins will be provided based on

the pedestrian flow. The receptacles will be from Victor Stanley and they will be black metal. The double bins will be placed where there is sufficient space along the sidewalk where they do not impeded pedestrian flow. Otherwise, the single bins will be installed in areas with more space restrictions. These new trash and recycling receptacles are being purchased as part of the \$100,000 Community Legacy Streetscape Grant that the Department of Planning and Zoning received this past year.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 10.C (page 76) recommendations, “use street furniture that is simple in design and constructed of materials such as wood and dark metal” and “improve consistency in design throughout the historic district for items such as street lights, traffic signals, public signage, trash receptacles and other street furniture.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted.

Testimony: The Applicant was not present. Ms. Tennor confirmed the receptacles will be black. Ms. Holmes said yes. Ms. Tennor asked Staff how many of the dual receptacles exist as opposed to the single receptacles. Ms. Burgess stated there are 27 of the singles throughout the historic district and a couple at the Courthouse. Ms. Burgess said all of the old singles will be removed and the new doubles will be installed where necessary and where people would like one. There will be about 18 to 20 receptacles. Mr. Hauser asked how will a person know which bin is for trash and which is for recycling. Ms. Burgess stated there will be labels on the receptacles that clarify the trash from the recycling bins. The style of lids being used have not yet been decided as there are a variety to encourage recycling or prohibit trash bags being piled on top. They will be the standard Victor Stanley options with holes, slits or trash openings and staff can approve this detail.

Public Comment

Ms. Tennor swore in Debra Korb, with Ellicott City Partnership. Ms. Korb read a statement: ‘The Ellicott City Partnership is in support of the proposal to install both trash and recycle receptacles on Ellicott City Main Street. The Partnership’s design committee reviewed many options and approved the Victor Stanley dual model. These receptacles will improve the appearance of Main Street and help with the litter and trash issues’.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to Approve. Mr. Shad seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Ms. Tennor moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Hauser seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 8:58 p.m.

*Chapter and page references are from the Ellicott City or Lawyers Hill Historic District Design Guidelines.

Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary

Eileen Tennor, Chairperson

Carol Stirn, Recording Secretary