



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

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

VOICE 410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-3042

June Minutes

Thursday, June 4, 2020; 7:00 p.m.

The June meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, June 4, 2020. Due to the State of Emergency and to adhere to social distancing measures, the meeting was not held at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, but was conducted as a virtual web meeting/conference call.

No one registered or otherwise contacted the Commission about testifying for any of the following applications.

Ms. Tennor moved to approve the May minutes. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Members present: Allan Shad, Chair; Eileen Tennor, Vice-Chair; Drew Roth, Secretary; Bruno Reich; Erica Zoren

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Lewis Taylor, Kaitlyn Clifford

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

Consent Agenda

1. MA-19-27c – 3575 Church Road, Ellicott City
2. MA-20-01c – 3637 Fels Lane, Ellicott City
3. HPC-17-72c – 6162 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge
4. HPC-19-01c – 8044-8048 Main Street, Ellicott City
5. HPC-20-30 – 3531 Sylvan Lane, Ellicott City
6. HPC-20-31 – 3892 College Avenue, Ellicott City
7. HPC-20-32 – 3612-3614 Court House Drive, Ellicott City

Regular Agenda

8. HPC-20-33 – 3646 Fels Lane, Ellicott City
9. HPC-20-34 – 6162 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge
10. HPC-20-35 – 6162 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge
11. HPC-20-36 – 8308 Main Street, Ellicott City
12. HPC-20-37 – 8308 Main Street, Ellicott City
13. HPC-20-38 – 7912 Savage Guilford Road, Jessup, HO-41
14. HPC-20-39 – 3880 Ellicott Mills Drive, Ellicott City
15. HPC-20-40 – Vicinity of 3850 New Cut Road, 3812 New Cut Road to 3776 St. Paul Street, Ellicott City
16. HPC-20-41 – 3958 and 3956 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City
17. HPC-20-42 – 8407 Main Street, Ellicott City
18. HPC-20-43 – 8407 Main Street, Ellicott City

19. HPC-20-44 – 8086, 8090-8092, 8129, 8137, 8307 Main Street
20. HPC-20-45 – 8390 Main Street, Ellicott City
21. HPC-20-46c – 8090-8092 Main Street, Ellicott City
22. HPC-20-47c – 8086 Main Street, Ellicott City
23. HPC-20-48c – 8133 Main Street, Ellicott City
24. HPC-20-49c – 8129 Main Street, Ellicott City



CONSENT AGENDA

MA-19-27c – 3575 Church Road, Ellicott City

Applicant: Kathleen Taylor

Request: The applicant, Kathleen Taylor, requests final tax credit approval for repairs made at 3575 Church Road, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT, the building on the property dates to 1895.

The applicant was pre-approved in June 2019 through the Executive Secretary process to make repairs on the house to the metal porch roof and bay window roof, inlaid gutters, soffits, and downspouts.

Scope of Work: The applicant has submitted documentation that \$3,485.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The applicant seeks \$871.25 in final tax credits. The work complies with that pre-approved and the cancelled checks and other documentation total the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the tax credit as submitted, for \$871.25 in final tax credits.

Testimony: Ms. Taylor was in attendance, but no further information was given or discussed.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

MA-20-01c – 3637 Fels Lane, Ellicott City

Applicant: Joseph Hauser

Request: The applicant, Joseph Hauser, requests final tax credit approval for repairs made at 3637 Fels Lane, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District and is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-1131, the Ezra and Ann Fell House. According to the Inventory form, the house on the property most likely dates circa 1820-1825.

The applicant was pre-approved for tax credits through the Executive Secretary process in January 2020 to replace the roof, gutters and repair the dormers.

Scope of Work: The applicant has submitted documentation that \$11,991.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work. The applicant seeks \$2,997.75 in final tax credits. The work complies with that pre-approved and the cancelled checks and other documentation total the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted for \$2,997.75 in final tax credits.

Testimony: Mr. Hauser was in attendance, but no further information was given or discussed.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-17-72c – 6162 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge

Applicant: Dan Engebretsen

Request: The applicant, Dan Engebretsen, requests final tax credit approval for repairs made at 6162 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Lawyers Hill Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1851.

The applicant was pre-approved for tax credits by the Commission on October 5, 2017 to repair the chimneys, install storm windows, repair and refinish the front door and lock, replace the metal kitchen roof with a standing seam metal roof and fill in the old cistern.

Scope of Work: The applicant has submitted documentation that \$26,049.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work, which would result in a tax credit of \$6,512.25. There was a mathematical error on the application and the work incorrectly totaled \$23,461.00 for a tax credit of \$5,865.25. The work complies with that pre-approved and the cancelled checks and other documentation total the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as corrected, for a final tax credit of \$6,512.25.

Testimony: Mr. Engebretsen was in attendance but no further information was given or discussed.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-19-01c – 8044-8048 Main Street, Ellicott City

Applicant: Barry Gibson

Request: The applicant, Barry Gibson, request final tax credit approval for repairs made 8044-8048 Main Street, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: These properties are located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT, the building on the property at 8044 Main Street dates to 1771 and the building on the property of 8048 Main Street dates to 1890.

Scope of Work: The applicant has submitted documentation that \$68,198.58 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work to repair the exterior of the building after the 2018 flood. The applicant seeks \$17,049.64 in final tax credits. The work complies with that pre-approved and the receipts and other documentation total the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the application for \$17,049.64 in final tax credits.

Testimony: Mr. Gibson was not in attendance, but no further information was given or discussed.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-20-30 – 3531 Sylvan Lane, Ellicott City

Applicant: Brandon Morris

Request: The applicant, Brandon Morris, request a Certificate of Approval to make exterior alterations and modify previously approved plans, at 3531 Sylvan Lane, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT, the house on the property dates to 1930.

This application was initially posted as a Minor Alteration on the Commission’s website, as case MA-20-22, but an objection was received from a citizen who believed the Minor Alteration deadline was suspended due to Executive Order 2020-03.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to make minor changes to work that was approved in HPC-18-65 (December 2018 and January 2019) to construct an addition and make corresponding exterior alterations. The current proposal makes slight changes to the approved plans, because there was a zoning setback issue that affected the approved design. The plans have been adjusted to comply with the 10-foot setback requirements. The plans submitted in the application show the approved and adjusted plans.

The front elevation will be reduced in width and will be reduced to a single car garage (originally a two-car garage). The window over the garage doors will change to a paired window (from a triple window). The rear elevation will now contain one window on the second floor, centered over three first floor windows. Originally there were three windows spaced evenly over the first-floor windows.

The applicant provided the following explanation of the minor changes:

“The building when originally approved was designed to a 6’ setback from the property line. In our meeting with zoning and permitting the building needed to be at the 10’ setback per code.

The redesign was us choosing to lose 4’ on the left side of the building (garage side) facing the front. This was the choice made instead of trying to go for an administrative adjustment. So the plot plan shows us losing 4’ to comply with the proper setbacks. This forced the dormer above the garage to go from 3 windows to 2 to keep it architecturally correct.”

The elevation incorrectly shows roofing shingles on the revised shed dormer, instead of siding. The applicant noted that was to remain siding and not become roofing shingles and submitted an edited view of this elevation to correctly show siding.




Figure 1 - Corrected view of shed dormer to reflect siding instead of roofing shingles.




Figure 2 - Current submission incorrectly shows roofing shingles instead of siding.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 7: New Construction: Additions, Porches and Outbuildings

- 1) Chapter 7 recommends, "attach additions to the side or rear of a historic building to avoid altering the primary façade. Consider the impact of the addition on side, rear and rooftop views of the building from public way."
- 2) Chapter 7 recommends, "design an addition to be subordinate to the historic building in size, height, scale and detail and to allow the form of the original structure to be seen."
- 3) Chapter 7 recommends, "design windows to be similar in size, proportion and arrangement to the existing windows. On historic buildings, or any building visible from a public way, windows should have true divided lights rather than interior or sandwiched muntins. A possible alternative is windows that do not have divided lights, but have permanent exterior grilles, appropriately detailed to be compatible with historic wood windows."

The changes are minor and are necessary to comply with zoning setbacks. The addition will be reduced in size as a result of the setbacks, from what was originally approved. The reduction of windows still complies with the Guidelines and will be compatible with the existing structure and overall design. All other components and materials will remain the same as originally approved.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Morris was in attendance, but no further information was given or discussed.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-20-31 – 3892 College Avenue, Ellicott City

Applicant: Matthew Wehland

Request: The applicant, Matthew Wehland, requests a Certificate of Approval and Tax Credit Pre-Approval to paint and make associated repairs at 3892 College Avenue, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building on the property dates to 1900.

This application was initially posted as a Minor Alteration on the Commission's website, as case MA-20-21, but an objection was received from a citizen who believed the Minor Alteration deadline was suspended due to Executive Order 2020-03.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to prep and paint the German lap siding on the house, Sherwin Williams "Serious Gray." As seen in the submitted photo, the area with German lap is the first-floor area that is yellow. The applicant will repair or replace in-kind any rotten/damaged wood. All other areas of the house will remain the same color (all trim, the second-floor red shingles, etc. will not be painted).

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

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

- 1) Chapter 6.D recommends, "Maintain, repair and protect (with paint or UV inhibitor is appropriate) wood siding, wood shingles or log construction."
- 2) Chapter 6.D 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."
- 3) Chapter 6.D considers the following Routine Maintenance, "Maintaining and repairing existing siding or shingles."

Chapter 6.N: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Colors and Painting

- 4) Chapter 6.N recommends, "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 small, important details, such as door or trim."

The proposal to prep, make any needed repairs or in-kind replacement of wood, and paint the siding on the house complies with the Guideline recommendations. The work is also eligible for tax credits, per Section 20.112 of the County Code.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Wehland was in attendance, but no further information was given or discussed.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-20-32 – 3612-3614 Court House Drive, Ellicott City

Applicant: David Warshaw

Request: The applicant, David Warshaw, requests a Certificate of Approval to make exterior alterations at 3612-3614 Court House Drive, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the buildings on the property date to 1966.

This application was initially posted as a Minor Alteration on the Commission's website, as case MA-20-23, but an objection was received from a citizen who believed the Minor Alteration deadline was suspended due to Executive Order 2020-03.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to install four poles, with attached light fixtures, to illuminate the upper portion of the apartment parking lot. The lights will be installed in the upper lot, closer to Court House Drive, as shown in the exhibits in the application. The poles will be 4-inch square, 15 feet tall, aluminum finished in a dark bronze color. The lights will be 120-Watt LED rectangular shoebox fixtures finished in a dark bronze color. The wiring will all be in-ground.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 10.D: Parking Lots, Public Streets and Street Furniture; Streetlights

- 1) Chapter 10.D explains the following light types are found in the district: "Rectilinear or box lights, used in public parking lots and along the lower section of Fels Lane. A dark pole with a simple box light, although modern in style, is unobtrusive during the day and highly efficient at night."
- 2) Chapter 10.D recommends, "When new streetlights or parking lot lights are needed, install traditional style, post-top fixtures made of dark metal, particularly in highly visible location. Use simple box lights, also with a dark finish, only for large parking lots, or for intersections where a taller pole is necessary."

The proposed streetlight will be located on a property that does not contain any historic structures. The streetlights will be appropriately scaled for use in the apartment parking lot.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Warshaw was in attendance, but no further information was given or discussed.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

REGULAR AGENDA

HPC-20-33 – 3646 Fels Lane, Ellicott City

Applicant: Michelle McDonald

Request: The applicant, Michelle McDonald, requests a Certificate of Approval and Tax Credit Pre-Approval to make repairs and exterior alterations at 3646 Fels Lane, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building on the property dates to 1900.

The applicant recently purchased the house and has found several things that need to be repaired. The applicant is still meeting with contractors to acquire cost estimates; but would like to seek pre-approval to begin making needed repairs.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes the following work:

- 1) Replace the existing main asphalt roof. The new roof will be Certaineed Landmark shingles (asphalt/fiberglass based construction) in the color Colonial Slate. Tax credit pre-approval for the work.
- 2) Repair and repoint the stone foundation of the house, which is cracked in some places and possibly patched with Portland Cement in others. Tax credit pre-approval for the work.
- 3) Trim trees around the house.
- 4) Remove an evergreen tree located in the front yard, that is growing close to the house and within the power lines. The tree appeared to have a dbh (diameter breast height) greater than 12-inches. May 21, 2020 update – this tree has been removed without approval and is now

before the Commission for retroactive approval. See the justification of tree removal farther below.

- 5) Replace the wooden stair railings leading to the side/rear yard. The railings are located on the west side of the house.



Figure 3 - Older photo from Google Streetview. Red square shows tree to be removed. Red circle shows wood railing to be replaced.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 6.E: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Roofs, Dormers and Gutters

- 1) Chapter 6.E recommends, "Replace historic roofing with asphalt shingles or other modern materials only is historically accurate materials cannot reasonably be used. Use asphalt shingles that are flat, uniform in color and texture and of a neutral color."

The roof on the main portion of the house is already an asphalt roof and has been so for many years, the change is not recent. The replacement of the worn asphalt roof, with a new asphalt/fiberglass shingle roof, in the color Colonial Slate, complies with the Guideline recommendations. The metal porch roof will remain as-is, and will not be replaced.



Figure 4 - Proposed Certaineed Landmark shingles

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

- 2) Chapter 6.C states:
 - a. "Carefully remove modern materials that have been applied over historic masonry."
 - b. "Use mortar mixes that are compatible with early stone and brick."
- 3) Chapter 6.C provides additional guidance on repointing, referring to the National Park Service's *Preservation Brief #1, Repointing Mortar Joints in Historic Buildings*.

The application explains that the foundation walls need to be repointed, but also shows other historic exterior stone walls that are in need of repair. It also appears some foundation walls have been previously repointed with concrete, which is not an appropriate treatment and can cause damage to the stone and wall. The applicant only recently moved into the house and is trying to handle the more urgently needed repairs, but has not yet met with the mason.

Staff recommends the HPC pre-approve tax credits for the proper repair of historic foundation and other historic walls on the property, with the final scope of work to be approved by staff. This would allow additional time for the County architectural historian to review the walls on the property and provide advice on the proper treatment of each wall (i.e. mortared or dry-stacked), and to review the proposal from the mason, once received by the property owner, to ensure the proposed repairs are appropriate.

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

- 4) Chapter 9.B recommends:
 - a. "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."
 - b. "Retain mature trees and shrubs, provide for their replacement when necessary."
- 5) Chapter 9.B recommends against:
 - a. "The removal of live mature trees, unless it is necessary due to disease or to prevent damage to historic structures."
 - b. "Topping trees, i.e., cutting off the main leader or other large branches."
- 6) Chapter 9.B considers the following to be Routine Maintenance, "General gardening activities, including moving, trimming, pruning, and installing ground covers."

While the removal of the front tree complied with the Guidelines, it was removed without approval. It was growing close to the house, and was scraping against the roof and growing in the power lines. Pruning of this tree to avoid the power lines would most likely result in topping the tree, which is not recommended and severely hurts the tree. If feasible due to the size and shape of lot, a new tree should be planted elsewhere on the property.

The proper pruning of other trees on the property (i.e. no topping of the trees) would be considered Routine Maintenance.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted, with tax credit pre-approval for the replacement roof and mortar repointing/wall repairs (with the final scope of the repointing and wall repair to be approved by Staff).

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in James McDonald. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. McDonald had anything to add to the staff report. Mr. McDonald said he had nothing to add to the staff report. Mr. Shad said the application was submitted on May 10, 2020; but it appears the actual tree was removed after the application was filed. Mr. Shad asked why the tree was removed after the application was submitted. Mr. McDonald said the family had recently moved to the area and did not know approval was needed to remove the tree.

Ms. Tennor asked for confirmation for item 5 – the stair railing on the side of the house and wondered if the railing will be replaced in-kind. Mr. McDonald said he would be making a similar structure with better wood.

Ms. Tennor said the slope drops off pretty sharply by the stairs and asked if that was why the applicants want a fence there, for something more secure. Mr. McDonald said the wood appears to be rotting and wants to replace it with modern, better treated wood. Ms. Tennor asked if that portion of the fence was historic. Mr. McDonald confirmed the portion of railing and fence were not historic.

Mr. Roth said the application is fine and concurs with staff recommendations.

Mr. Reich said that the application was straight forward, but had questions about mortar repointing and Ms. Holmes explained the application contained several different areas for repointing, but when Mr. McDonald's wife had submitted the application, she had not yet met with a mason. Ms. Holmes explained that while some of the areas appeared to be part of the house, others appeared to be historic walls on the property and staff needed a chance to confirm all of the walls were historic and wanted to see a scope of work from the mason.

Ms. Zoren agreed with all the comments that had already been said. Ms. Zoren explained to the applicant that if he wanted to change the non-historic railing to be a different style that was more historically appropriate, or color, it would be okay with the Commission because the current railing is not historic. Ms. Zoren said if they decide to change the railing to a different style, that needs to be resubmitted with detail; otherwise she found replacing in-kind was okay.

Mr. Shad said he understood the applicants were new to the neighborhood but asked that the applicant become familiar with the Guidelines or come to staff if they have questions.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to approve the application as submitted, and to follow up with staff about repointing the mortar and changes for non-historic fence/stair railing. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-20-34 – 6162 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge

Applicant: Dan Engebretsen

Request: The applicant, Dan Engebretsen, requests a Certificate of Approval and Tax Credit Pre-Approval to make exterior alterations and repairs at 6162 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Lawyers Hill Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1851.

This application was initially posted as a Minor Alteration on the Commission's website, as case MA-20-24, but objections were received.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to make the following repairs and alterations to the main house and requests tax credit pre-approval for the work:

- 1) Replace rotten cedar siding with new siding to match the existing. Prep and scrape peeling siding. Paint house – siding, trim, doors, windows.
- 2) Repair shutters as needed and replace missing shutters with wood to match existing in design. Paint all shutters and install.
- 3) The following new paint colors will be used:
Front door – wood grain faux paint, per Guideline recommendations.
Windows – dark brick red, Colony Red AE-6
Siding – a light gray, Polished Silver AE-49
Trim – a medium gray, Gray Cast AE-50 and White 3800
Shutters – Molten Black AE-54

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 5: Routine Maintenance

- 1) Chapter 5 states the following is Routine Maintenance: "Repair or replacement of roofs, gutters, siding, external doors and windows, trim, lights, and other appurtenant fixtures using the same materials and design."

Chapter 6.E: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Siding and Shingles

- 1) Chapter 6.E recommends:
 - a. "Maintain and repair existing wood siding or wood shingles."
 - b. "When necessary, replace deteriorated wood siding or shingles with materials that match the original as closely as possible in texture, size, shape and that maintain the original shape and width of details such as cornerboards and door and window trim."

Chapter 6.J: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Shutters and Blinds

- 2) Chapter 6.J recommends,
 - a. "Maintain and repair original shutters and blinds."
 - b. "For replacements, install wood shutters or wood blinds that maintain the size, proportions and locations of the originals. If the replacements are not operable, they should at least appear to be so with hinges and hold backs appropriate to the period of initial construction."

The repair and in-kind replacement of the siding and shutters is considered Routine Maintenance and complies with the Guideline recommendations.

Chapter 6.O: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Colors

- 1) Chapter 6.O recommends, "Use colors appropriate to the period and style of the building."
- 2) Chapter 6.O considers the following to be Routine Maintenance – "Painting previously painted surfaces using the colors listed in the following chart on a house of the appropriate architectural style. For buildings that are a mix of styles or do not fit clearly into any style, use one of the following methods to determine which colors are routine maintenance. For houses that are a mix of styles, use the colors listed for the architectural style of the original or dominant block of the house."

The proposed colors comply with those recommended in the Guidelines as recommended by the architectural type of the building.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Dan Engebretsen. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Engebretsen had any information to add to the staff report. Mr. Engebretsen said he had nothing to add to the staff report.

Ms. Tennor said she thought the application was straight forward and thought the tax credit preapproval was appropriate for all the changes and repairs were warranted. Mr. Roth and Mr. Reich had no questions.

Ms. Zoren said she had some concerns with the red window frames being eye catching against the grey siding. Ms. Zoren asked if the window frames were already red. Mr. Engebretsen confirmed all the window frames were red. Ms. Zoren said as the windows were being kept in a similar shape, she had no issues. Mr. Shad said he had no questions.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve the application, including tax credit preapproval, as submitted. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-20-35 – 6162 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge

Applicant: Dan Engebretsen

Request: The applicant, Dan Engebretsen, requests a Certificate of Approval to make exterior alterations at 6162 Lawyers Hill Road, Elkridge.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Lawyers Hill Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1851.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to make exterior alterations to three outbuildings (garage, workshop and greenhouse) located on the property, as described below. The outbuildings include a garage, workshop and greenhouse. The garage does not appear to be historic, but the dates of construction for the greenhouse and workshop are unknown by staff.



Figure 5 - Aerial view of structures on property

Garage

The applicant proposes to make the following alterations to the garage:

- 1) Remove the existing white vinyl siding and replace it with a rough 8-inch board placed perpendicular to the ground. The photo example provided indicates board and batten style siding. All seams, corners and trim to be covered with a 3-inch board.
- 2) Replace the existing metal garage doors with a wood carriage style "X" pattern garage door with a 4-light transom.
- 3) Extend the front overhang/rake by 12 inches.
- 4) Paint all new siding white.
- 5) Replace the current asphalt roof with GAF Timberline HD Shingles in the color Hickory (a reddish-brown).




Figure 6 - Existing garage



Figure 7 - Proposed roof shingle color for all outbuildings.



Figure 8 - Proposed board and batten siding, to be painted white, for all outbuildings.



Figure 9 - Proposed carriage house "X" style doors for garage and workshop.

Greenhouse

The applicant proposes to make the following alterations to the greenhouse:

- 6) Remove the existing white vinyl siding and replace it with a rough 8-inch board placed perpendicular to the ground. The photo example provided indicates board and batten style siding. All seams, corners and trim to be covered with a 3-inch board.
- 7) Paint the new siding white.
- 8) Replace the current asphalt roof with GAF Timberline HD Shingles in the color Hickory (a reddish-brown).
- 9) Replace the Plexiglass windows and paint the rock-faced concrete block white to match the new siding.




Figure 10 - Existing greenhouse.

Workshop

The applicant proposes to make the following alterations to the workshop:

- 10) Remove the existing white vinyl siding and replace it with a rough 8-inch board placed perpendicular to the ground. The photo example provided indicates board and batten style siding. All seams, corners and trim to be covered with a 3-inch board.
- 11) Paint the new siding white.
- 12) Replace the current asphalt roof with GAF Timberline HD Shingles in the color Hickory (a reddish-brown).
- 13) Replace the existing metal garage door with a wood carriage style "X" pattern garage door with a 4-light transom.



Figure 11 - Existing workshop.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 3: Architectural Styles in Lawyers Hill

- 1) Chapter 3 explains, "There is also a diverse collection of outbuildings in the district, including a rustic Adirondack gazebo, garages dating from the early auto age, and board and batten barns."

Chapter 6.E: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Siding and Shingles

- 2) Chapter 6.E explains, "The most common exterior wall material in the Historic District is wood siding consisting of overlapping wood boards running horizontally. Both clapboards and German siding are found. Wood shingles, painted or stained, are used on several house. Vertical board and batten wood siding is used on part of one house and on outbuildings.
- 3) Chapter 6.E recommends, "Remove asbestos shingles or other coverings to restore original wall material."
- 4) Chapter 6.E recommends against, "Changing the scale of siding; eg. Replacing narrow 4"-5" clapboard with 8" siding."

While the garage building does not appear historic, staff is unclear on the age of the other structures. The greenhouse structure appears to be historic, but the age of the structure it is attached to is unknown. The Historic Sites Inventory form does not provide any information as to the age of the outbuildings.

The Guidelines reference board and batten in conjunction with outbuildings. The proposed removal of the vinyl and the change to wood siding complies with the Guideline recommendations and will also make all outbuildings one consistent style. The outbuildings are not visible from the public right-of-way.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Engebretsen was previously sworn in. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Engebretsen had anything to add to the staff report.

Mr. Engebretsen said the three outbuildings have vinyl siding and are not historic buildings, but he was still asking the Commission for permission to put up wood siding, architectural roof shingles and garage doors on the outbuildings.

Ms. Tennor said she thought the proposed changes to the outbuildings would improve their appearance and did not have problems with the proposed changes.

Mr. Roth and Mr. Reich had no objections to the application.

Ms. Zoren said in Figure 6 of the staff report, there was an existing garage with a basketball hoop, and noted the siding on the garage in Figure 6 did not have vinyl siding. Ms. Zoren asked if Mr. Engebretsen was proposing to add vertical wood siding on that garage as well.

Mr. Engebretsen explained that the garage Ms. Zoren referenced had a fire before he purchased the property and a lot of the vinyl siding was burnt so he tore it off. Mr. Engebretsen said the top part of the garage is foam board where the basketball hoop was located. Mr. Engebretsen said he would be replacing the garage with all vertical wood siding as well.

Mr. Shad said he had no questions.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve the proposal as submitted. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-20-36 – 8308 Main Street, Ellicott City

Applicant: Mark Hemmis

Request: The applicant, Mark Hemmis, requests a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations made at 8308 Main Street, Ellicott City.

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

While the application is currently before the Commission for retroactive approval, it was installed by the television show that recently filmed in Ellicott City and not by the business owner. Due to the “surprise” nature of the show, the business owner was unaware that the alteration was taking place.

In September 2018, The Fund for Art in Ellicott City submitted an Advisory Comment/Pre-Application Advice application to receive feedback on multiple locations for future murals. This building was included in that list as a possible location, but the Commission did not recommend a mural on this building. The Fund for Art in Ellicott City did not end up pursuing this location due to Commission feedback.

Scope of Work: The applicant seeks retroactive approval for the mural that was installed on the side of the building. The mural was painted on canvas, which was then adhered to the brick on the side of the building; the mural is not painted directly on the brick. The mural depicts several different scenes from Ellicott City, including the railroad bridge sign that is visible from Baltimore County, the view of Main Street looking east at the Church Road intersection and the Caplan’s sign.



Figure 12 - Mural on side of building

The production company provided the following information about the installation of the mural:

- The mural can stay up on the brick for 5+ years. It will not last long term.
- It was affixed to the wall with a Nova Gel 208 glue.
- To get the canvas painting down you would just simply cut the glue from the back of the canvas off the wall, then use a 3000 PSI pressure washer to get the glue off the wall. The pressure washer will not hurt the brick; it will only remove all of the glue, dirt and grime from the wall.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 11.B.9: Signs, Commercial Buildings, Wall Murals

- 1) *Chapter 11.B.9 explains, “Painting a sign directly on a wall or other structural part of a building is not permitted by the county Sign Code. However, the Board of Appeals may grant a variance for such signs if they are found to contribute significantly to the historical, architectural or aesthetic character of the area. A wall mural that does not advertise or identify an area is not a sign and is not regulated by the Sign Code. Well-executed artwork such as wall murals can make a positive*

contribution to the historic district. Any wall mural, whether or not it is a sign, requires approval by the Historic Preservation Commission."

The mural depicts various iconic scenes found in Ellicott City and is well-executed artwork.

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

- 2) Chapter 6.C recommends against:
 - a. "Replacing or covering original masonry construction."
 - b. "Painting historic stone or historic brick that has never been painted or removing paint from masonry walls that were originally painted."
 - c. "Cleaning or removing paint from masonry walls using methods that damage the masonry."
- 3) Chapter 6.C recommends, "Carefully remove modern materials that have been applied over historic masonry."
- 4) Chapter 6.C explains, "Masonry is easily damaged by harsh cleaning, paint removal or waterproofing methods, or use of the wrong type of mortar...An application to repair, clean or remove paint from masonry must specify in detail the method to be used." This section also refers people to the National Park Service (NPS) Preservation Briefs for more information on masonry repair. The Preservation Briefs, specifically Brief 6, **Dangers of Abrasive Cleaning to Historic Buildings**, consider pressure washing to be an abrasive removal method at certain high pressures.

The historic brick surface was not an ideal surface for the mural to be glued on. While the production company states that the glue can be pressure washed off, that is incorrect as the historic brick could easily be damaged by a pressure washer. The NPS Preservation Briefs, specifically Brief 6, **Dangers of Abrasive Cleaning to Historic Buildings**, consider pressure washing to be an abrasive removal method at certain high pressures. At whatever point the mural is removed, the Preservation Briefs should be consulted prior to removal and the application for removal should specify the method to be used to remove the glue coating without damaging the brick.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC determine if the mural and installation methods comply with the Guidelines and approve or deny accordingly. If the HPC approves the application, Staff recommends the HPC approve a 5-year limit on the mural, unless the mural begins to deteriorate sooner.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Mark Hemmis. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Hemmis had anything to add to the staff report. Mr. Hemmis explained that he did not know about the mural until it was installed. Mr. Hemmis said the mural was a great addition to the area and was drawing good attention and had become a focal point. Mr. Hemmis said the mural was in good condition, but if it needs to come down in five years that would be fine, but he would like to see it stay.

Ms. Tennor had two comments; this application was the second case that had come before the Commission where the applicant was the recipient of surprise outside design service and the Commission was also surprised. Ms. Tennor said this is not the way the application process is supposed to work and reiterated that when there is exterior work in the district, it is supposed to be approved by the Commission beforehand.

Ms. Tennor said her second concern was how the mural was glued to the historic brick wall. While the people who donated the improvement assured the Commission there was no problem with this kind of application, apparently this glue might need to be pressure washed off which is not good for brick,

especially antique brick. She said that pressure washing compromises the surface of the brick and weakens it structurally. Ms. Tennor was worried that in five years' time there may be a problem with the glue on the brick. Ms. Tennor said she was not inclined to approve the application after the fact. Ms. Tennor said she did not have issues with the picture itself, but with the glue.

Mr. Hemmis said he had only learned a few weeks ago that the mural was not approved. He said the production company had gone through with other approvals for the historic district. Mr. Hemmis said he agrees with the Commission's concern with the surprise changes. He said the mural was completed by a professional mural company and he has been assured the glue will come off. The company told Mr. Hemmis the mural was primarily glued on the outside perimeter. Mr. Hemmis brought up the point that there have been many instances of pressure washing brick after the floods. Mr. Hemmis said it would be a travesty to take the mural down at this point. Mr. Hemmis said he agrees it should have been approved beforehand, but said the mural is an asset for the top part of the hill.

Mr. Roth shared his concern for how work had been done without approval and said there needs to be some transparency. Mr. Roth asked who set the terms to make changes and do the work; that party has never come before the Commission and Mr. Roth said that was part of the problem. Mr. Roth said the mural was nice.

Ms. Burgess said the County was asked about the mural and location. She stated that a mural painted on the wall was not an option, but said that it was implied by the producers that they would hang a canvas-like mural on a temporary basis. County Staff told the production team to use mortar joints and that not screwing into the brick wall was important. However, the production team applied the mural on the wall in a different manner, that seems not as temporary.

Mr. Reich said the mural fabric was glued to the wall. Mr. Reich said he did not think the mural would last five years anyway. Mr. Reich said the other problem was the other two murals approved went through a year-long vetting process, including where they would go, colors and what the mural would be/what would be depicted. He said those murals added to the composition of Ellicott City and wouldn't be in patrons faces as they were installed on side streets, on the sides of buildings. Mr. Reich said he was a bit conflicted about the application. He said the mural was not in your face coming down Main Street and was wedged between two buildings. The mural did not have bright colors that obstructed architectural features. Mr. Reich said the mural depicted a lot of historic things in Ellicott City. He did not think the mural was bad and said it should have a maximum of 5 years approval and removed the moment it starts to deteriorate. Mr. Reich cautioned if anything were to be installed in place of this mural, that alteration should go through the normal approval process.

Ms. Zoren said she agreed on the issues about the approval process. Ms. Zoren said the mural was not facing Main Street or obstructing architectural features. She said it was a valid spot to have a mural and said if it had been something that came to them during the original mural selection process, it would have fit with the theme of Ellicott City and the colors blend into the building. The overall composition is appropriate for Ellicott City. Ms. Zoren said her biggest issue was the temporary nature of the mural. Ms. Zoren agreed with a five-year limit, or earlier if the mural deteriorates.

Mr. Shad said he shared similar concerns that Ms. Tennor mentioned, especially in regard to the surprise nature of the alterations. He said the building was included previously when discussed in the mural applications of September 2018, but the Commission did not recommend a mural on this building.

Ms. Tennor asked if it was possible to not approve the application, but allow it to remain for the period as recommended by staff. Mr. Shad said the Commission can either approve or deny the application.

Ms. Burgess said that the Commission cannot ignore the application, the mural would be vulnerable for violations and would have to come back to the Commission if it was in violation.

Ms. Holmes said the staff report included a suggestion that the removal of the mural require approval, in order to know what the method would be. She explained that the National Park Service Preservation Briefs recommend performing a small test area of various pressures to determine what does not cause damage, before removing the whole project. Ms. Tennor said this requirement would alleviate her concerns about the glue.

Mr. Hemmis explained he has been in Ellicott City for 18 years as a tenant, that he recently purchased the building last week and put his application in for the mural as soon as he heard it had not been approved. Mr. Hemmis said that he was here for the long haul and would honor any conditions the Commission puts on him.

Ms. Tennor said Mr. Hemmis was an asset to Ellicott City. Ms. Tennor said it would be good to try and stick to the historic preservation code. Ms. Tennor thought it made sense to approve the mural with conditions that when the mural will be removed, 5 years or before depending on condition, if any point if the mural is thought to need to be removed, tests will be done for the residue on the brick from the glue.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve the application with the mural to remain with a maximum of 5 years, to be removed sooner if it shows signs of deterioration and the method of removal shall be brought before the Commission for approval. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-20-37 – 8308 Main Street, Ellicott City

Applicant: Mark Hemmis

Request: The applicant, Mark Hemmis, requests a Certificate of Approval for to make exterior alterations at 8308 Main Street, Ellicott City.

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

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to install two awnings on the exterior of the building. The awnings have been removed from their current location at 8049 Main Street and moved to 8308 Main Street on the back and side doors.

The applicant proposes to install the wider awning on the gray door rear door, shown in Figure 13 and the smaller awning on the green door on the side of the building, shown in Figure 14. Dimensions were not provided of the doors or the awnings.




Figure 13 - Rear metal door and proposed wider awning.



Figure 14 - Side door and proposed awning



Figure 15 - Red arrow points to rear metal door and red circle shows side door. Please note – the colored brick around the red circle is only chalk.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 6.L: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Awnings

1) Chapter 6.L recommends:

- a. *"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 nonreflective canvas or another strong fabric, in a color compatible with the building façade."*
- b. *"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 shed style, but have been on the building at 8049 Main Street and were approved by the Commission in 1990. While shed style is the recommended style, circular awnings such as these have been approved for use on other buildings, such as on Tersiguel's across the street. If approved to relocate the awnings, the awning frame should be installed in the mortar, not the brick. The mortar can easily be repaired in the future if the awnings are to be removed, but the brick cannot be repaired as easily.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted and recommends the HPC consider a maintenance/replacement component to an approval.

Testimony: Ms. Holmes clarified the proposed awnings were not installed, only removed from their original location at 8049 Main Street, and the staff report was in error. Mr. Hemmis was already sworn in.

Ms. Tennor said she preferred shed style awnings and understood the awnings had previously been approved at a different location. Ms. Tennor said she could not get a feeling of scale as the awnings were being moved to a different set of doors. Ms. Tennor said the new submittal showing the awnings over the doors did not help her understand the proportions

Mr. Hemmis said the awning from Figure 14 of the staff report would go over a side alley door that cannot open. The awning is from the original front door of the Phoenix Emporium and is significantly smaller and would only extend out a few inches on either side of the newly proposed location. The awning from the Maryland Avenue side of 8049 Main Street would go over the back door of 8308 Main Street, which is the main delivery door and provides protection from the elements. Ms. Tennor said the awnings would be in locations that were not very visible, but would provide a function.

Mr. Roth said it was a wonderful idea to repurpose the awnings in display and he had no objection to the request.

Mr. Reich said the awnings have become historic themselves and that the awnings fit in the locations of the new building.

Ms. Zoren noted there may be a conflict on the back door location where the awning is to be added. Currently there is a light in that location, and it may need to be replaced. Ms. Zoren said if the applicant had to move the light, they would need to come back to the Commission for approval of the light relocation. Ms. Zoren reminded the applicant install the awnings and light in the mortar, not brick.

Mr. Shad was glad to see the awnings reused and agreed with Mr. Roth. Mr. Shad said the awnings cannot be seen on either location on Main Street, so he had no issue with the application.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-20-38 – 7912 Savage Guilford Road, Jessup, HO-41

Applicant: Kevin Favorite

Request: The applicant, Kevin Favorite, requests tax credit pre-approval to make repairs at 7912 Savage Guilford Road, Jessup.

Background and Site Description: This property is not located in a historic district, but is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-41, the Commodore Joshua Barney House.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to make the following repairs and alterations:

- 1) Replace five air conditioning units. The outdoor air conditioning units will be replaced with indoor geothermal units and six vertical wells for the ground loop exchange.
- 2) Replace three water heaters and make repairs to the radiator and baseboard heating elements.
- 3) Electrical panel upgrades are needed for the geothermal system. The house has three 200 AMP electrical panels. One panel is an older style not commonly used today, and needs to be replaced in order to spread the load for the geothermal units. This panel also branches out to two 100 AMP sub-panels and has connections to a generator that no longer exists. The other 200 AMP panels will need new circuits and breakers for the installation of the geothermal heat pump and air handlers.
- 4) Replace attic insulation. The attic has fiberglass batt rolls of insulation. Some areas of the attic have no insulation, no ridge vents, no attic hatch insulation, air sealing or recessed light canister covers. The application proposes to install ridge vents, seal air gaps and seams, cover recessed lights to prevent fires and install borate cellulose blown in insulation to R-49, install insulation around the attic hatch door opening and seal the attic ductwork with mastic tape.
- 5) Repair or replace gutters to be consistent with the half round gutters that are currently on the house.
- 6) Repair holes on the side of the house on the newer addition.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Sec. 20.112. - Historically valuable, architecturally valuable, or architecturally compatible structures

(ii) Eligible work includes:

- a. *The repair or replacement of exterior features of the structure;*
- b. *Work that is necessary to maintain the physical integrity of the structure with regard to safety, durability, or weatherproofing;*
- c. *Maintenance of the exterior of the structure, including routine maintenance as defined in section 16.601 of the County Code;*

(iii) Eligible work does not include:

- a. *New construction;*
- b. *Interior finish work that is not necessary to maintain the structural integrity of the building.*

Sec. 20.113. - Restorations and rehabilitations of historic or heritage properties.

(b)(5) Qualified expenses means the amount of money paid by the owner of an eligible property to a licensed contractor for improvements, restoration, or the rehabilitation of the property or for materials used to improve, restore, or rehabilitate the property.

The Commission should determine if the work listed under Items 1-3 are considered eligible work under the tax credit in Section 20.112 of the County Code; the work does appear eligible under the tax credit in Section 20.113, as it will improve the property.

The work listed under Item 4 appears to be eligible for both credits as the work will maintain the physical integrity with regard to safety, durability and weatherproofing for the 20.112 tax credit and will improve the property under the 20.113 tax credit.

The repair or replacement of the gutters, under Item 5, would be eligible for both tax credits for the historic portion of the house.

The work listed under, Item 6, the exterior wood trim repairs to the modern addition are not eligible for tax credits, but any repairs to this type of damage on the historic structure are eligible.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC:

For the tax credit under Section 20.112, Staff recommends the HPC:

- 1) Determine if Items 1-3 are eligible.
- 2) Approve Item 4-6, for the historic portion of the house only.

For the tax credit under Section 20.113, Staff recommends the HPC:

- 1) Approve Items 1-6, with Items 5 and 6 to relate specifically to the historic structure.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Kevin Favorite. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Favorite had any additional comments to add to the staff report. Mr. Favorite said he had no comments to add to the staff report.

Ms. Tennor said in reference to items 1, 2, and 3 of the scope of work, she found the proposed improvements to be in-keeping with the preservation of the structural integrity of the house. Ms. Tennor said that none of the improvements will be visible on the outside and will not impact the historic appearance. Ms. Tennor noted that in the past, the Commission has found improvements like the one proposed to mitigate moisture, temperature, etc. an enhancement to the structural integrity. Ms. Tennor said the application was eligible for tax credits. Ms. Tennor notes items 4, 5, and 6 are fine and appropriate.

Mr. Roth said he concurred with Ms. Tennor; the application was fine and had no other questions.

Mr. Reich said items 1-3 are needed to preserve the structure and are appropriate for tax credit preapproval. Mr. Reich echoed Ms. Tennor's comments about past approvals for air conditioning and heating control to preserve buildings. Mr. Reich said he has walked through the house and knew the improvements were need. The insulation, gutters, etc are straightforward and appropriate for tax credit preapproval.

Ms. Zoren said she agreed with Mr. Reich; and said the new heating and cooling system will replace some of the window AC units and help restore the original look of the house.

Mr. Shad said he agreed with the Commissioners comments and agreed with the tax credit pre-approval.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to approve the application as submitted, the improvements should be approved for tax credits for 20.112 and 20.113. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-20-39 – 3880 Ellicott Mills Drive, Ellicott City

Applicant: Lisa Wingate

Request: The applicant, Lisa Wingate, requests a Certificate of Approval for to make exterior alterations (some retroactive) at 3880 Ellicott Mills Drive, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: The property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District and is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-315, the George Burgess House. According to SDAT the building dates to 1800, but the Historic Sites Inventory indicates the building was most likely constructed in the 1840s.

The property owners have been before the Commission for several other cases regarding the repairs and alterations to this house and site (10-21, 11-42, 12-14, 12-22, 12-44, 13-13, 13-14, 13-48, 13-49, 15-10, 15-45, 15-53, 16-59, MA-17-14 and 17-45). The most recent case, HPC-20-08a and 20-08b in March 2020 was for the construction of a pool and the addition of other site features.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes new alterations, as well as changes to previously approved or withdrawn plans from 20-08a and 20-08b (from the March 2020 meeting, the application incorrectly states May 2020). While the application requests the D&O for 20-08a and 20-08b be amended, this application will be treated as a new proposal and the previous D&O will not be amended.

The new work includes:

- 1) Install 13 new up-lights within the backyard pool enclosure. The spotlights will be anchored in the planting beds between the walls to provide subtle illumination of the upper stone wall at night. The spotlight will be Luxor NP ZDC with the finish Bronze BZ.
- 2) Install small retaining wall on lower patio (below the barn in the front of the property) to prevent erosion from washing into patio. The new wall will be installed perpendicular to the existing wall and will not exceed the height of the existing wall. The wall will diminish in height toward Main Street, the south side.
- 3) Install an 87-inch by 87-inch (7.25 feet by 7.25 feet) American Whirlpool Model #471 hot tub to be placed on the existing concrete pad. The hot tub will have wood and other brown tones. Install a 48-inch wide wood step to facilitate access and a cover in a neutral color.
- 4) Install a 24-inch wide stainless-steel utility wash and prep sink on legs against the east side of the previously approved shower enclosure shed. The sink will be screened with an Inkberry evergreen shrub and additional plantings will be added within the forest conservation area between the property and Ellicott Mills Drive.

The work proposed that relates to HPC-20-08a includes:

- 5) In March 2020, HPC-20-08a, the Applicant withdrew the request for Item 6 (kitchen porch step lights). The applicant now requests approval for this item, to install the kitchen porch step lighting, to be centered in every other riser of the kitchen porch. The light will be painted a powder coated white to match the step risers.

The changes to the work approved in HPC-20-08b includes:

- 6) The Applicant proposes to change the original proposed and approved location for the placement of two Kichler Ashland Bay carriage style light fixtures on the pergola, originally Item 21 in HPC-20-08b. The fixtures were originally to be placed on the inside posts of the pergola facing the pool (east). The applicant now proposes to install them facing the fireplace (west) on the posts closest to the pool.

- 7) The Applicant requests retroactive approval for changes to Item 13 from HPC-20-08b, the construction of double retaining walls on the west side of the property. The north end upper retaining wall was extended by an 11-foot long addition (diminishing in height) to hold back earth at the NW corner of the pool. The extension makes no changes in height (ranging from 26-inches to grade), and only lengthens the wall to transition with the existing grade. This wall extends from the east end of the previously approved wall. The wall will be constructed with the previously approved materials, consisting of Carderock stone and a natural stone cap.
- 8) The Applicant requests retroactive approval for changes to Item 13 from HPC-20-08b, the construction of double retaining walls on the west side of the property. The Applicant requests retroactive approval to add a 14-foot long retaining wall at the south end of the upper retaining wall. This wall will also diminish in height to transition with the grade of the land and will be constructed with Carderock stone and a natural stone cap.
- 9) For Item 12 from HPC-20-08b, on the existing retaining wall, the applicant proposes to replace the bullnose cap with bluestone.
- 10) For Item 13 from HPC-20-08b, the construction of new retaining walls (this is incorrectly labeled Item 12 in the application), the applicant proposes to change the capping material of the wall from Carderock stone to 16-inch wide bluestone. This bluestone cap will be used on the pergola piers for consistency.
- 11) For Item 15 from HPC-20-08b, the applicant proposes to install a third millstone on the new fireplace (the new fireplace was Item 14 from HPC-20-08b). This millstone will be centered on the fireplace, framed on either side by the previously approved millstones.
- 12) For Item 25 from HPC-20-08b, the applicant seeks approval for the anchoring method of the hot tub cedar posts to make them removable. This item was approved within HPC-20-08b and it is unclear if there are changes different from that discussed at the meeting.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

New work:

Chapter 9.E: Landscape and Site Elements, Outdoor Lighting Fixtures

- 1) Chapter 9.E recommends, “choose and locate lighting fixtures to be visually unobtrusive. Use dark metal or a similar material.”
- 2) Chapter 9.E recommends, “use freestanding lights that are no more than six feet high for individual residential properties.”
- 3) Chapter 9.E recommends, “to the extent possible, direct or shield lighting so that it does not create glare or spill onto neighboring properties. Design lighting to provide a reasonable level of brightness for the intended purpose.”

Spotlights – The spotlights will be small, not visible from the public right-of-way and will bronze. The new spotlights are intended to up light the stone retaining wall and not create glare on neighboring properties. The spotlights comply with the Guidelines.

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

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

Lower Patio Retaining Wall Extension – The new retaining wall extension will match the existing wall in material and height and complies with the Guidelines.

Hot Tub – The Guidelines do not address items such as hot tubs, however it will be located in the rear yard and not visible from the public right-of-way, although it will be visible from the neighboring

property on the rear (Burgess Mill apartments). The hot tub will have brown and wood tones and will be neutral in color as a result. The applicant was also approved for screening in HPC-20-08b.

Chapter 7: New Construction: Additions, Porches and Outbuildings

- 5) Chapter 7 recommends, “design outbuildings visible from a public way to be compatible in scale, form and detailing with historic structures and outbuildings in the neighborhood.”

Stainless Steel Utility Sink – The sink will be stainless steel, which is not a color that is consistent with the use of dark metals on the property. The applicant does propose to screen the sink with landscaping and install it next to the shower shed, however, it would not be common to find a modern outdoor sink next to an outbuilding, rather than inside the outbuilding. The HPC should determine whether the stainless-steel sink is appropriate in its material and location as it pertains to the guidelines.

Proposed work that relates to HPC-20-08a:

Chapter 9.E: Landscape and Site Elements, Outdoor Lighting Fixtures

- 6) Chapter 9.E recommends, “place attached lighting fixtures in traditional locations next to or over a door.”
- 7) Chapter 9.E recommends, “choose and locate lighting fixtures to be visually unobtrusive. Use dark metal or a similar material.”

Kitchen Porch Step Lights – The frame house addition and attached porch (referred to kitchen porch) are modern additions and are not historic. The orientation of the kitchen porch steps is such that the railing is more visible upon approach than the staircase risers. The Guidelines recommend attaching light fixtures in traditional locations, such as next to or over a door. However, the addition of the white recessed step lights would not adversely impact the structure since it would be applied to modern steps on a modern addition that are not highly visible. In this location, the white step lights would be unobtrusive, which complies with the Guidelines.

Changes to work previously approved in HPC-20-08b:

The installation location changes to the two Kichler Ashland Bay carriage style light fixtures on the pergola (originally Item 21 in HPC-20-08b) are minor and do not affect the historic structure or setting.

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

8) Chapter 9.D recommends:

- a. “Construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures, particularly for features visible from a public way.”
- b. “Construct new terraces or patios visible from a public way from brick, stone, or concrete pavers designed to look like indigenous stone.”

The extension of the retaining walls (originally Item 13 from HPC-20-08b) on the west side of the property utilizes the same construction materials as originally approved with Carderock walls, and as requested for alteration as detailed in this report to use a bluestone cap.

The proposal to replace the cap material on the existing retaining wall (originally Item 12 from HPC-20-08b) with a bluestone cap, and the proposal to change the lower of the double retaining wall caps (originally Item 13 from HPC-20-08b) to bluestone complies with the Guidelines, as the material is still a natural stone.

The additional millstone does not affect the historic structure or setting. Three other millstones have already been approved for use on the property in HPC-20-08a (on millstone at the driveway) and HPC-20-08b (originally Item 15 – two millstones approved the outdoor fireplace).

The cedar posts to hold the shower curtain screening (originally Item 25 from HPC-20-08b) was approved in HPC-20-08b for removable posts. The Guidelines do not address a scenario such as this, but this method is similar to installing a footer for a decking post and would not impact the view. A more common screening method would be to utilize an outdoor umbrella that tilts.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC determine whether the stainless-steel sink is appropriate in its material and location as it pertains to the guidelines. Staff recommends the HPC approve all other changes as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Lisa Wingate. Ms. Wingate said the homeowner, Laura Steensen would be listening in on the call, but not testifying. Mr. Shad asked if Ms. Wingate had any comments to add to the staff report. Ms. Wingate said the sink would be 24 inches wide and would be functional and utilitarian for the owner. Ms. Wingate said the sink would be extremely limited in visibility. The addition of the extra landscaping would make the sink invisible to everyone except someone who walks up to the sink. Ms. Wingate said the homeowner wants the stainless-steel sink as requested.

Ms. Tennor said she had no questions and that all of the numerous changes are small; no problem with adding an additional millstone, lights to kitchen steps, small stone wall additions are consistent with the rest of the site details. Ms. Tennor said it would appear that the visibility of the sink was very low. Ms. Tennor said the only other dark metal sink that would be particularly historic would be galvanized steel and it would not be appropriate.

Mr. Roth said he had no issue with the application.

Mr. Reich said all the changes are in keeping with the original application and follows the guidelines. Mr. Roth said he has no issues with the stainless-steel sink.

Ms. Zoren said the changes seem to fit with the rest of the landscape and while the stainless-steel sink is not a historic material, the durability is better than another materials.

Mr. Shad said he agreed with the other Commissioners, the proposals are fairly minor changes to what had been already presented to the Commission. Mr. Shad said he had no problems with any of the changes.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-20-40 – Vicinity of 3850 New Cut Road, 3812 New Cut Road to 3776 St. Paul Street, Ellicott City

Applicant: Mark DeLuca, Deputy Director, Howard County Department of Public Works

Request: The applicant, Mark DeLuca, Deputy Director from the Howard County Department of Public Works, requests a Certificate of Approval for the retroactive exterior alterations at the vicinity of 3850 New Cut Road, 3812 New Cut Road to 3776 St. Paul Street, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. There are no buildings on this site; only three remaining historic walls. The Howard County Department of Public Works previously submitted applications to remove trees and make other exterior alterations at this site in HPC-19-17 in May 2019, due to the road collapse from the 2018 flood.

Scope of Work: The applicant seeks retroactive approval for the removal of four trees and an increase in the limit of disturbance of the scope of the project. The applicant explains that the original application, HPC-19-17 “included the removal of 28 trees to facilitate the project. An inadvertent omission from the listing of 28 trees to be removed failed to identify two trees, which also were required to be removed, located within the project’s approved limit of disturbance. At this time, one of the two trees has been removed; and DPW determined that it is no longer necessary to remove the other tree. DPW is requesting retroactive removal to remove one tree (T-104).” Tree 104 is shown in the documents submitted within the application and was a Tulip Poplar with a dbh of 24.9 inches. The application states that removal of this tree was necessary for the installation of a water line, delivering potable water to properties in the area.




Figure 16 - Location of T-104, T-94, T-95 and T-97

The application also explains that “during the course of the work, an unforeseen condition (slope failure) necessitated the immediate removal of three trees (T-94, T-95, T-97), and expansion of the original limit of disturbance. The trees were removed by the Contractor, as the Contractor felt immediate action was necessary to preclude the possibility of further slope failure.” The original tree survey states that Tree 94 was a 16-inch Black Locust in fair condition; Tree 95 was a 27-inch Black Locust in fair condition; and Tree 97 was a 16.4-inch American Sycamore in fair condition.



Figure 17 – Location of Tree 104 removal




Figure 18 - Area of slope failure and T-94, T-95 and T-97 removal, picture from application

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

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

- 1) Chapter 9.B explains, "Ellicott City's natural setting is essential to its character. In projects that involve grading land, clearing vegetation or building new structures, care should be taken to protect and enhance natural features, views of important natural features, and the

- environmental setting of historic buildings. The Historic Preservation Commission will review the impact of such proposals on the historic setting of Ellicott City and particularly on the relationship of historic buildings to their sites."
- 2) Chapter 9.A recommends, "Maintain and reinforce natural landscape elements, such as rock outcroppings, water courses and tree lines. Make views of natural elements, especially the Patapsco River and its tributaries, available to the public where possible. Provide walkways, sitting areas and casual stopping spots in parks, plazas, and other areas open to the public."
 - 3) Chapter 9.B recommends, "Retain mature trees and shrubs. Provide for their replacement when necessary."
 - 4) Chapter 9.B recommends against:
 - a. "The removal of live, mature trees, unless it is necessary due to disease or to prevent damage to historic structures."
 - b. "Extensive clearing for new construction that can be accommodated by more limited removal of vegetation."
 - 5) Chapter 9.B states the following requires approval: "Removing live trees with a diameter of 12 inches or greater 4.5 feet above ground level."

It appears that T-104 was included on the original documents provided to the HPC in case 19-17, but was not highlighted along with the other trees to be removed, and in fact, was an omission. The documents submitted with the application do not reference replacing the trees.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC determine if the application complies with the Guidelines and approve or deny accordingly.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Mark DeLuca from the Department of Public Works. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. DeLuca had anything to add to staff comments or report. Mr. DeLuca said he did not have anything to add.

Ms. Tennor said that it was her understanding the terrain was partially still in motion when DPW was trying to stabilize the infrastructure and decide what trees needed to come out causing a shifting in the ground DPW had not anticipated.

Mr. DeLuca said that was true for three trees, but the request is for two different issues that DPW wanted to handle together. The project required that they replace a water line that ran perpendicular to the stream. There were two trees on the original plan (HPC-19-72) that were to be removed, but the exhibits in HPC-19-72 accidentally omitted those trees. The original request was the approval for the removal of 28 trees, but two of the trees were missing from the request for approval. DPW was not aware of the omission until all the trees were counted against the exhibit and DPW realized one tree was missed and they needed to come back for approval. He said it was Tree 103 or 104 that was missed on the original submission (the application states it was Tree 104).

Mr. DeLuca said the second issue was found on May 13. DPW found out there was an active slope failure and the contractor could not construct the wall the way they wanted to. Mr. DeLuca referred to supplemental information, the left-hand side photo shows area of slope failure. The plan was to work from the bottom of the slope and drop it back, make it flatter, to put the caissons in the base. One of the ways to make it safe was to cut a bench (shown on the exhibit as a yellow rectangle going across the slope). DPW staff noticed trees were removed and saw three trees removed that were about 12 inches. DPW amended the May 13 application to include the three trees that were removed. Mr. DeLuca said the contractors was afraid the trees would fall down and any equipment put down there would be

damaged by the trees. Mr. DeLuca said the contractors had an opportunity to tell DPW what they were going to do with the trees but didn't which is why DPW applied for the retroactive approval.

Ms. Tennon said it was quite a slope and she had no further questions.

Mr. Roth said he thought it was okay and made some observations. Mr. Roth asked Mr. DeLuca if tree 103 and 104 were only one or two feet apart. Mr. DeLuca said they could be about 3 to 5 feet apart. Mr. Roth said the trees appear to be very close together, and explained over time Tulip Poplars get very big and taking one out is not a bad thing to do, as it helps them to grow better. Mr. Roth said the other trees were black locust, which are not native to Maryland. Mr. Reich thanked DPW for documenting the application so precisely, and stated he had no concerns.

Ms. Zoren thanked Mr. DeLuca for his documentation and asked that in the future to come to Commission before taking down trees.

Mr. Shad asked if the hill was starting to fail before the trees were removed. Mr. DeLuca said the photo shows a new slope failure, the slope is very loose. He explained that once the failure started, it started to work its way to the top. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. DeLuca thought this was in the process before the trees were removed. Mr. DeLuca said yes. Mr. DeLuca also explained that at the May 2019 meeting, DPW didn't have a tree plan to show. Mr. DeLuca submitted a supplemental tree plan, to show what trees are being planted.

Motion: Ms. Tennon moved to approve the application as submitted, in compliance with the guidelines. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-20-41 – 3958 and 3956 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City

Applicant: Agila Sundaram

Request: The applicant, Agila Sundaram, requests Advisory Comments on the proposed subdivision at 3958 and 3956 Old Columbia Pike.

Background and Site Description: This property is not located in the Ellicott City Historic District and is not listed on the Historic Sites Inventory, but it does contain two historic structures eligible for inclusion on the Historic Sites Inventory. According to SDAT, the historic structure at 3958 Old Columbia Pike dates to 1937. This structure retains historic integrity in both architecture and setting. According to SDAT, the house at 3956 Old Columbia Pike dates to 1934. This house retains less architectural integrity, as the façade has been heavily altered with modern changes. This house also fronts Old Columbia Pike and will be separate from the remainder of the subdivision.

The applicant previously submitted this plan for Advisory Comments in May 2019 in case HPC-19-25 and proposed to demolish the historic house at 3958, retain the house at 3956 and create 7 new lots. At this time the property was reported to be 4.284 acres, but is now being reported as 5.47 acres. The property is zoned R-ED.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to retain two houses, demolish 1 shed and create 8 buildable lots; 2 lots for the existing historic houses and 6 new buildable lots. The new buildable lots directly in the vicinity of the historic house at 3958 Old Columbia Pike vary in size from 9,846 square foot to 13,155 square feet. There will be two open space lots (Lots 9 and 10) for a total of 3.2383 acres. The historic house at 3958 Old Columbia Pike will be retained on a 14,160 square foot lot.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations: As these structures are not located in the historic district or on the Historic Sites Inventory, there are no criteria that specifically provide guidance. Retention of the historic houses demonstrates an interest in preserving historic properties. However, the subdivision plan appears to maximize the density allowed on the site, placing new homes very close to the existing historic house at 3958 Old Columbia Pike. While there are two historic homes on the site, the house at 3958 is the one that retains its historic character. This house also has a unique setting, perched on top of the hill overlooking the meadow and small valley on the property. The setting will be lost with the subdivision and construction of the new homes, in particular Lots 2 and 6. These two lots are placed within direct viewshed of the historic house at 3958, with no buffer space to separate it from the new development.

The new homes are shown in a “modern craftsman style,” which is not compatible with the existing historic house at 3958 Old Columbia Pike. The house at 3958 was constructed in the Tudor Revival style. The examples provided of the new homes will be significantly larger than the existing historic house, share no similar architectural features, and impact the viewshed and setting of the historic structures.




Figure 19 - Blue circle indicates location of historic house




Figure 20 - Historic house in the Tudor Revival style at 3958 Old Columbia Pike



Figure 21 - Proposed "modern Craftsman" architectural styles

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC provide advice on the proposed design, which infringes on the historic building and setting at 3958 Old Columbia Pike. Staff recommends the HPC provide advice on the design of the new structures, which are significantly larger and not architecturally compatible with the existing Tudor Revival historic structure at 3958 Old Columbia Pike.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in property owners Agila Sundaram, Mukesh Kumar and their civil engineer Stephanie Tuite from Fisher, Collins and Carter. Mr. Shad asked if any of the applicants had comments on the staff report.

Ms. Sundaram clarified that the area for lot placement expanded as the applicants are now including land of 3956 in the subdivision area not just 3958 as had been the plan submitted last year. Ms. Sundaram said they will be retaining both houses at 3956 and 3958 Old Columbia Pike and adding 6 new lots. The placement of the new lots is in areas that do not infringe on the viewshed, the lots are placed on the north and west sides of 3958.

Ms. Sundaram spoke to the concerns about Lots 2 and 6 from the staff report. Lot 2 is on the west side, and that property sits much lower than the current house since the historic house sits on top of a hill. Ms. Sundaram did not find this area significant to the site, so Lot 2 was placed there. Lot 6 was also at a lower grade, so she did not think this would impact the viewshed. The applicants are preserving a specimen tree and other pine trees. Ms. Sundaram said they were okay with having Lot 6 where it is or moving it.

Ms. Sundaram said the current house at 3958 does not have any garage, the footprint is less than 1500 square feet. The proposed homes look larger because of two car garages. Ms. Sundaram said she was happy to incorporate comments to style the new houses.

Ms. Tennor said she was glad to see a Tudor style to be more compatible with the existing home and understands the constraints that leave the garage as the main feature of the façade on new construction. Ms. Tennor said it would be great to avoid the garages on the front faces of the new buildings. Ms. Tennor had no comments on footprints or setbacks, but agreed with staff that the new homes should be compatible with the existing house, which has no garage.

Mr. Roth said he was trying to figure out the specimen tree chart. Mr. Roth asked if all the specimen trees would be removed or if some would stay. Ms. Sundaram said that there are only two trees that are proposed to be removed. They are the trees in front of the existing house, the trees are in bad condition anyway and its best to remove them. Otherwise the applicants will be retaining all the other trees. Mr. Roth asked which trees were in bad condition specifically which trees from 1 to 15 were to be removed.

Ms. Tuite said Trees 3 and 4 are in poor condition, and are located by the line of the driveway. Mr. Roth said Tree 15 might be removed. Ms. Tuite said Tree 15 is located along the driveway, but near the adjacent property. She said the condition of the tree is what is driving the tree removal. Mr. Roth said he concurred with the comments that it would be better if the houses were compatible with the style and mass of the historic homes. Mr. Roth said it was not about the overall square footage, but the massing, and suggested some thought be given to make the new homes compatible in architectural style and mass.

Mr. Reich said the area around the historic house will be graded down and the vegetation will be wiped out. He suggested providing evergreen vegetation between the historic house and the new development. Mr. Reich said he was grateful the historic house is being saved and that he was thankful the applicants came back in with a new plan to save the house. Mr. Reich said the density in the development is as high as it can be on the property and noted there were only thirty feet between the houses. Mr. Reich suggested providing heavy landscaping between the historic houses and new development.

Ms. Sundaram said there was another plan that shows vegetation and its mostly lawn with a septic system. The plan does not show any proposed trees, everything shown is existing. Mr. Reich suggested dense plantings.

Ms. Zoren thanked the applicants for leaving both houses and appreciated their attempt to cluster the development. Ms. Zoren said the plan has too much density and that Lot 2 is really problematic with the mass infringing on the viewshed. Ms. Zoren said the viewshed of the existing house could be improved if the applicants curve the road toward the historic house, instead of directing it abruptly turning it toward the new house. The driveway to the new house would be an offshoot, and the driveway would appear to be for the main historic house. Ms. Zoren said Lot 2 does not fit and will encroach on the historic house. Ms. Zoren said she is also concerned about Lot 6, as other Commissioners mentioned the massing and building height. She said the house to the right will be 3 stories next to the 1.5 story cottage. Ms. Zoren encouraged the applicants to consider side loading garages. Ms. Zoren said she appreciated the applicants trying to do something unique with the styling of the houses that are not cookie cutter. Ms. Zoren said the massing is an issue. She agreed that an evergreen landscape buffer should be provided throughout. Ms. Zoren said she would like to see a grading and planting plan.

Ms. Sundaram said the grading and planting plan was not presented at this meeting as she wanted to focus more on the schematic plan at this time, but said they could incorporate the grading and planting plan. Ms. Sundaram said she thought the off-shoot drive was a great idea.

Mr. Shad agreed with the other Commissioners comments about the styles of the houses and would like to see something more compatible with the current houses. The presented plan looks like stone mansions compared to what is presently there. Mr. Shad said he had an issue with the density and thought it would be more appropriate to have three lots that would be larger in size than to stack five houses in the development.

Ms. Sundaram said she understood where the Commission was coming from and the reason the houses were clustered in the back was because of the R-ED zoning and the stream buffer. The 75-foot setback to the stream is the reason for the clustered and doubled up in the back of the house. Most of the lot is open space and preserved. Ms. Sundaram said they would work on the massing and heights of the property as mentioned.

Motion: No motion as this case was for advisory comments.

HPC-20-42 – 8407 Main Street, Ellicott City

Applicant: Donald R. Reuwer Jr.

Request: The applicant, Donald R. Reuwer Jr., requests a retroactive Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations at 8407 Main Street, Ellicott City

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 2001. This is not the date that the primary structure was built. It reflects when a second floor was added and the entire exterior was altered with the addition of the brick veneer, storefront windows and doors. According to Joetta Cramm’s book, *Historic Ellicott City, A Walking Tour*, Martin’s blacksmith shop once stood at this location, but was torn down, and in the 1930s Charley Miller of Miller Chevrolet built a gas station; later Dick Wall had a garage here. The building was reportedly later used as storage in the 1960s for the Ellicott City Fire Station across the street at 8390 Main Street. In 1980 the three-bay single story concrete block gas station/garage existed in its most likely original condition as documented in an “Inventory of Buildings – Ellicott City” report by Kamstra, Dickerson & Associate. The 1980 report notes the distinguishing architectural details on the former gas station were “1930s Spanish tile applied gas station fake facade roof detail. Roof was plain built-up type behind parapets.” The report notes the building was considered a “Non-Contributing Structure.”



Figure 22 - Mural installed without approval

In July 1999 (case HDC-99-31) the current owner applied to the Commission to add the second story and renovate the entire building. The Staff report at that time recommended approval of the alterations, noting the building had “negligible historic value.” The renovated building with the second floor has been altered since it’s 1999-2001 construction recently with the painting of the brick and alteration of front doors. The painting and alterations of the doors was approved through the Minor Alterations process (MA-18-13 for the doors and MA-18-20 for the painting) due to the fact that the building was not considered historic.

Scope of Work: The applicant installed a mural that was painted on two 4x8 sheets of plywood, which were attached to the exterior of the front of the building. The mural consists of six dogs and one cat. The mural is located on the front wall of the building, outside of the retail space for Canine Clippers Café. The application states that the artwork is designed for tourist enjoyment.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 11.B.9: Signs, Commercial Buildings, Wall Murals

- 1) Chapter 11.B.9 explains, “Painting a sign directly on a wall or other structural part of a building is not permitted by the county Sign Code. However, the Board of Appeals may grant a variance for such signs if they are found to contribute significantly to the historical, architectural or aesthetic character of the area. A wall mural that does not advertise or identify an area is not a sign and is not regulated by the Sign Code. Well-executed artwork such as wall murals can make a positive contribution to the historic district. Any wall mural, whether or not it is a sign, requires approval by the Historic Preservation Commission.”

As the mural does not identify a business, it would not be considered a sign. However, the mural of dogs and cats does directly relate to the business, which is a pet food and supply store.

The artwork was well executed and has not been painted directly on the building. In this case, the brick façade is not historic and the brick has been painted as well. The mural is located on the edge of the building, and there are parking spaces that block the view of the mural to some extent, when filled with cars.



Figure 23 - Location of mural on building

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC determine if the mural complies with the Guideline recommendations and approve, modify or deny accordingly.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Don Reuwer. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Reuwer had anything to add to the staff report. Mr. Reuwer said he wanted to do something whimsical after the 2018 flood. Mr. Reuwer said he hired the same artist who did the mural on the Reedy building. Mr. Reuwer said the mural was completed for the visitors to have fun with, it was painted on plywood and could easily be removed as it is screwed into brick. He said it was done as a temporary nature and could be taken down at any time.

Ms. Tennor discussed that the Commission was being asked to approve another mural after the fact. Ms. Tennor agreed that the mural was whimsical. She said if there was one single “woof” or “meow” on the panel it would be a second sign for the business in the building. It just barely makes it not a sign. Ms. Tennor said she was inclined to approve it, but she was not sure what to say to an applicant who had installed a mural with less charm or artistic quality. Ms. Tennor agreed with Mr. Reich’s previous comment, the Commission spent a lot of time reviewing areas for other murals and now there were two murals that the Commission did not have a chance to review before the fact. Ms. Tennor said she was not inclined to have the mural removed, but it’s almost not a mural because it is related to the business.

Mr. Roth said he was fine with the application. He said that at some point, someone will come in with a retroactive mural for approval and that mural might be ugly and they may wish they had come for approval.

Mr. Reich said the Commission went through a year-long process for the murals that were approved and they were careful where the murals were located, what they would depict and the colors that would be deployed. Mr. Reich said the blue background takes away about 2/3 of the painting which was good. He said the Commission would not have approved putting the mural on the face of the building. Mr. Reich noted that there was no significance to the mural, it was a whimsical piece of art. He said the Commission has approved whimsical art before on a time frame basis, like the eggplant by the Post Office. Mr. Reich said if they approve it, there should be a timeframe on it and then they review it again after that timeframe. Mr. Reich asked what the other Commissioners thought.

Ms. Tennor said the application sets a bad precedent to approve things after they have been executed and asked how the Commission would say no to retroactive approvals in the future.

Ms. Zoren said there have been a lot of retroactive approval requests. She said the one thing this application did not have in common with the other requests was that this request fronts directly on Main Street. The other requests were on a side wall and not on Main Street. She said this application

would set a precedent for Main Street. She said the Phoenix was on an alley. She said the Commission has never approved a mural on the front of a building.

Mr. Shad shared his concern with being asked to approve applications retroactively. Because this mural was painted on plywood and attached to the wall, it is something that could easily be removed. Mr. Shad asked why the mural was installed before it was approved. Mr. Reuwer said that right after the flood everyone was depressed, and he wanted to do something whimsical. Mr. Reuwer had planned on taking it down before the meeting but it was suggested that he submit for a retroactive approval. Mr. Reuwer said he owns another location in Clarksville and that tenant would love to have the mural. He said people in Ellicott City like the mural and will not be happy about it being removed. Mr. Reuwer said that was the Commission's call he did not care one way or another.

Ms. Tennor said if the application had come to the Commission for approval, she was inclined to think she would have voted to approve it, but finds the retroactive approval request puts the Commission in an awkward position unnecessarily.

Mr. Reich said he did not think the Commission would have approve the mural request if it had come before them under normal circumstances. He said that if it was a sign on Main Street, they would have said no, that it was too big and had too many colors. If someone had put this in their storefront, they would have said no. If someone had painted something on plywood and attached it on the front of a building, they would have said no. Mr. Reich said that if the mural had come before them beforehand, they probably would have said no, there are too many paintings in Ellicott City that are not going through the vetting process, not in keeping with the façade or any of the Guidelines that the Commission upholds.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to deny the application as submitted. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion passed 4 – 1 with Mr. Roth in opposition to the denial.

HPC-20-43 – 8407 Main Street, Ellicott City

Applicant: Veronica Daniel

Request: The applicant, Veronica Daniel, requests a retroactive Certificate of Approval to install a sign at 8407 Main Street, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This building is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT and HPC records, the second floor of the building was constructed over an existing 1940s garage in 2001 and the entire exterior renovated as a result.

While the application is currently before the Commission for retroactive approval, it was submitted prior to the alteration taking place as part of the television show that recently filmed in Ellicott City. Due to the "surprise" nature of the show, it was also unknown at the time if the business owner would want to keep the improvement, as she was unaware it was taking place. This application could not be processed until the mural, which was installed without approval, was submitted to the Commission and approved.

Scope of Work: The applicant requests a retroactive Certificate of Approval to install a blade sign on the front of the building at 8407 Main Street. The sign is located above the door at the entrance to the business, which is located on the lower left side (if looking at the building). The sign is 24-inches high by 32-inches wide for a total of 5.59 square feet. The sign is shaped like an oval, with a navy blue

background, a red border and gold/yellow text and graphic of a dog. The sign is an HDU (high density urethane) sign that is routed around the text and graphics. The sign will read on four lines:

CLIPPER'S
 (silhouette graphic of a dog)
 Pet Food &
 Supplies

The sign replaces the large vinyl banner that was serving as a sign in lieu of permanent signage.




Figure 24 - Sign rendering



Figure 25 - New business sign

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 11.A: Signs, General Guidelines

- 1) Chapter 11.A recommends:
 - a. "Use simple, legible words and graphics."
 - b. "Keep letters to a 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."
 - c. "Emphasize the identification of the establishment rather than an advertising message on the face of the sign."

The sign complies with above stated guidelines. The sign used simple, legible words and graphics and contains the name of the business, with the brief tagline "Pet Food and Supplies" in order to clarify the nature of the business.

Chapter 11.A: Signs, General Guidelines

- 2) 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."

The colors used in the sign (navy, red and gold) coordinate, and do not clash with, with the blue color of the building façade.

Chapter 11.A: Signs, General Guidelines

- 3) Chapter 11.A recommends, "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 is constructed from high density urethane (HDU), which is comparable to wood in appearance, such as its ability to be carved, routed and painted; and in dimension, as it has a thickness comparable to a carved wood sign. The sign complies with this guideline.

Chapter 11.B: Signs, Commercial Buildings

- 4) Chapter 11.B recommends, "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 complies with the above stated guideline as it will be 5.59 square feet, within the recommended range.

Chapter 11.B: Signs, Commercial Buildings

- 5) Chapter 11.B recommends against, "Extending the sign vertically above the window sill of the second story of the structure." The Guidelines explain, "in general, signs should not be mounted on an upper story, where they have limited visibility and can easily create the appearance of clutter and excessive signage. Limiting signs to the first floor helps in maintaining a visual boundary between the storefront and upper story facades."

Generally, the guideline makes sense to limit signs to the first floor of the building. However, due to the design of this building, there is no clear area on the first floor that would serve to hold signage. Additionally, because the building is set back from the street, the location of the sign seems to be the best for visibility.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Reuwer was previously sworn in. Mr. Taylor asked if Mr. Reuwer was testifying in approval of the application. Mr. Reuwer said he did not have anything to do with the request. Mr. Taylor asked if Mr. Reuwer was going to testify to the application but did not put the request in. Mr. Reuwer said he owned the building and he likes the sign. Mr. Taylor clarified that Mr. Reuwer is speaking in support of the application and is not the applicant.

Mr. Roth asked who the owner of the business was. Mr. Reuwer said Kate Bowman was the owner of the business. Ms. Burgess said this would be the official last retroactive approval with the reality tv show associated with Gordon Ramsay. Ms. Holmes added there was a banner on the building for quite some time and it was replaced with this sign. Ms. Holmes said the sign was an improvement.

Mr. Roth asked if the Commission denied the sign, who would incur the cost of removing the sign. Mr. Roth said Ms. Bowman was not here and the Commission does not know if Ms. Bowman knows about the sign. Mr. Reuwer said Ms. Bowman knew about the sign and she approved it and worked with the production crew to put it up. Mr. Reuwer said there are pictures of Ms. Bowman putting the sign up and she was quite excited about it.

Ms. Burgess said Ms. Bowman was aware the application was being heard. Mr. Reich said he thought the application should be tabled until next month when the business owner could be present to answer questions. Ms. Burgess said the business owner was not the applicant so the Commission could not make her attend the meeting. Ms. Holmes said Veronica Daniel was the applicant. Ms. Holmes asked if the Commission knew what questions were going to be asked of Ms. Bowman, that would be the reason for the delaying the application a month. Ms. Tennor concurred with Ms. Holmes question.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to approve the sign, as it meets the guidelines. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion passed 4 -1, with Mr. Shad in opposition.

HPC-20-44 – 8086, 8090-8092, 8129, 8137, 8307 Main Street

Applicant: Donald R. Reuwer, Jr.

Request: The applicant, Donald R. Reuwer, Jr., requests a Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations made to 8086, 8090-8092, 8129, 8137, 8307 Main Street.

Background and Site Description: These properties are all located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT, the properties have the following dates of construction: 8086 Main Street circa 1890, 8090-8092 Main Street circa 1890, 8129 Main Street circa 1900, 8137 Main Street circa 1906 and 8307 Main Street circa 1930.

All of these properties were significantly damaged in the 2016 and 2018 floods, resulting in damage or destruction to the doors. If any of the doors were original or historic, they were destroyed in the 2016 flood, so any replacements made after the 2018 flood were not of original or older historic doors.

Scope of Work: The applicant seeks retroactive approval for the installation of doors at to 8086, 8090-8092, 8129, 8137, 8307 Main Street after the 2018 flood. The previously existing doors were wood doors and the new doors are metal, all colors match the previously existing. The new metal doors are intended to be more flood resistant (not flood-proof), than the previously existing doors. Photos are included below, when possible, to show that the doors replaced after the 2018 flood had already been destroyed by the 2016 flood.

8086 Main Street

The previously existing wood doors on 8086 Main Street were first destroyed in the 2016 flood and new doors were installed, replicating the door paneling details prior to the flood. These doors were then destroyed in the 2018 flood. The current doors, installed after the 2018 flood, are metal doors, with a similar $\frac{3}{4}$ light arrangement, but lack the previously existing panel detail.



Figure 26 - Doors in April 2016



Figure 27 - Damage from 2016 flood



Figure 28 - Current doors

8090-8092 Main Street

The door on this building was not historic. The previously existing door was a full light wood door, and was destroyed in the 2016 flood. The door that was installed after the 2016 flood, was then destroyed in the 2018 flood. The current door is a metal door, with a ¾ light configuration, to better protect from potential rising flood water and debris.



Figure 29 - Door from 2012




Figure 30 - Damage from 2016 flood



Figure 31 - Current door

8129 Main Street

The previously existing door (prior to the 2016 flood) at this location was a full light wood door. The current door is a full light metal door, with a wider metal frame around the glass than the previous wood door.



Figure 32 - Door from 2011



Figure 33 - Damage from 2016 flood




Figure 34 - Current door

8137 Main Street

Google Streetview imagery is not clear enough to determine what the doors were prior to the 2016 flood and staff is working remotely without access to the paper files. However, the door that existed prior to the 2016 flood, was destroyed in that flood. The doors were damaged/destroyed again the 2018 flood, after which the applicant installed the ¾ light metal doors, painted black to match the previously existing color.



Figure 35 - Damage from 2016 flood



Figure 36 - Current doors

8307 Main Street

Four doors at 8307 Main Street were replaced with the metal doors following the 2018 flood. It is unclear which ones were actually damaged or destroyed in the flood.



Figure 37 - Current doors on 8307 Main Street

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 6.G: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Entrances

- 1) Chapter 6.G explains, "Historically, most Ellicott City doors were painted, paneled wood. Six-panel and eight-panel doors were used during the early period. In the Victorian era, four-panel, arched doors were common. Typical commercial doors from the late 19th and early 20th century were paneled wood with glass panes in the top half. These doors remain common in the commercial area of the historic district, although modern metal and glass doors are also found."
- 2) Chapter 6.G states, "When a new door is needed, it should reflect the character of the original door. Simple paneled doors of wood or wood and glass are usually best, but metal doors with an appropriate style and finish can convey a similar appearance."
- 3) Chapter 6.G recommends, "When repair is not possible, replace historic doors and entrance features with features of the same size, style and finish."
- 4) Chapter 6.G recommends, "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 application generally complies with the Guidelines. In most instances the doors were not original, even prior to the floods. The intent of these replacement doors was to be able to better withstand flood water and debris, as this was the second time these doors were damaged or destroyed in a flood. The

doors at 8086 Main Street had a panel detail below the window opening on the door. This panel detail was not continued with the metal door. The doors at 8090-8092, 8129 and 8137 appeared to be full light wood replacement doors prior the flood and were replaced with full light to ¾ light metal doors after the 2018 flood. The change to a ¾ light door in some instances will assist in better protection from potential flood water and debris.

Four sets of doors at 8307 Main Street were replaced. While the doors facing Main Street and the parking lot were most likely affected by flood water, it is unclear why the doors on the side entrance along Forrest Street were replaced, as they sit at a higher elevation than the other doors. The previous door style at these locations is unknown.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC determine if the various replacement doors comply with the Guideline recommendations, and approve, modify or deny accordingly.

Testimony: Mr. Reuwer was previously sworn in. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Reuwer had anything to add to the staff report. Mr. Reuwer said after the floods he was trying to put the buildings back together as fast as he could. The wood doors did not work. The doors Mr. Reuwer put up were flood resistant, not flood proof. Mr. Reuwer ordered the new doors to look as close to the previous doors as possible. Ms. Holmes said the Commission had approved this type of door on other buildings.

Ms. Tennor said the Commission has approved metal doors, and the new doors look like the old doors the applicants replaced. Ms. Tennor said her only issue was the doors were installed without approval from the Commission. She said that had the application come before the Commission prior to the work being done, the Commission could have been expedited the request. Ms. Tennor said she did not have a problem with the doors being installed, only the sequence of events.

Mr. Roth said the Commission was looking at a retroactive Certificate of Approval and a tax credit for something the applicant did retroactively. The Commission and Staff discussed procedures for the assessment tax credit applications, to be heard later that evening. Mr. Roth said he was okay with the request.

Mr. Reich said the doors look good and explained how the construction will provide protection for the building. The doors look like the applicants were trying to match what was there previously.

Mr. Reuwer said he tried to match the doors as close as possible. The doors were destroyed both in the 2016 and 2018 floods, and the original doors were impossible to match. Mr. Reich said the doors come pretty close except for the wider rail and the piece of metal on the bottom of the door for protection. Mr. Reich asked if 8137 Main Street had a full glass door. Mr. Reuwer said 8137 had a full glass door. Mr. Reich said he thinks the doors turned out well.

Ms. Zoren said the doors are okay as submitted.

Mr. Shad said the doors are pretty close to the style that was previously there.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-20-45 – 8390 Main Street, Ellicott City

Applicant: Donald R. Reuwer, Jr.

Request: The applicant, Donald R. Reuwer, Jr., requests a retroactive Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations made to 8390 Main Street, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1938-1939.

The application explains that the basement of this building was flooded in the 2016 and 2018 floods.

Scope of Work: The applicant seeks retroactive approval for filling in the basement door and window openings with stone. This work was done after the 2018 flood, as an emergency measure to protect the building in future flood events. The work was done by the same contractor who filled in the basement openings at Tersiguel's.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 6.G: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Entrances

- 1) Chapter 6.G recommends against, "Changing the size of door openings; blocking or filling door openings, transoms or sidelights."
- 2) Chapter 6.G recommends, "Restore doorways, transoms or sidelights that have been filled in, using physical, pictorial or documentary evidence to accurately restore the building's historic appearance."

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

- 1) Chapter 6.H recommends against, "Removing, adding or altering a window opening on a building's primary façade or in any location where it affects historic features key to the building's character."
- 2) Chapter 6.H recommends, "Restore window openings that have been filled in, using physical, pictorial or documentary evidence to accurately restore the building's historic appearance."

The door and window openings were filled in as a method to flood proof the building. The former openings are not located on the front façade of the building, but are located on the rear of the building. This side of the building abuts the stream channel, directly next to a large culvert opening. This building is also located next to the Parking Lot F, which was damaged significantly in the 2018 flood, with the destruction of Ellicott Mills Drive and the historic stone court house building.

The openings were filled in using stone, a common historic building material in the district, in a manner that makes it clear where the opening previously existed. As a result, it would be easy to restore the openings in the event that flood mitigation removes the risk from this side of the building.



Figure 38 - Aerial view of the rear of the building.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted.

Testimony: Mr. Reuwer was previously sworn in. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Reuwer had anything to add to staff comments. Mr. Reuwer explained that after the 2016 flood the public was pretty optimistic in Ellicott City, but after the 2018 flood the tenants of this building wanted to leave. Mr. Reuwer said that he and his team had to act in order to make the tenants feel safe. Mr. Reuwer decided to close up the windows to keep the tenants. Mr. Reuwer apologized for not getting approval from the Commission prior.

Ms. Tennor and Mr. Roth did not have any questions or comments about the application.

Mr. Reich asked if the windows of the buildings were taken out and filled with stone. Ms. Holmes confirmed that Mr. Reich was correct. Mr. Reich said window replacement with stonework needed to be done all over town. Mr. Reich noted the Commission had seen applications such as this application previously. The stone matched as close as possible to what was originally on the building and old window opening remains there as an architectural feature.

Ms. Zoren said she agreed with Mr. Reich and appreciated that the applicants kept the header and matched the stone as much as possible. Ms. Zoren reiterated to the applicant to put an application in before completing any work, especially work that would be hard to remove.

Mr. Shad said he echoed the same sentiments as the rest of the Commission members. Mr. Shad reminded the applicant that the Commission has bent over backwards to accommodate applicants after the flood with additional meetings and the Minor Alteration process.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-20-46c – 8090-8092 Main Street, Ellicott City

Applicant: Donald R. Reuwer, Jr.

Request: The applicant, Donald R. Reuwer Jr., requests final tax credit approval for the 20.113 assessment historic property tax credit for improvements and repairs made to 8090-8092 Main Street, Ellicott City after the May 2018 flood.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1890. The building was damaged by the May 2018 flood and the assessment on the structure was lowered to \$1,000.00. Upon completion of the repairs, the building was re-assessed at \$216,400. The difference in the assessment that may be eligible for the tax credit is \$215,400.00.

Scope of Work: The Applicant seeks final tax credit approval for the assessment tax credit (Section 20.113 of the County Code) and submitted documentation that a total of \$31,595.89 was spent improving or restoring the building. The estimated potential tax credit this property could qualify for, based on the amount spent in restoration, the current assessment and the current tax rate, is \$2,184.16.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

- 1) *Section 20.113 defines qualified expenses as "the amount of money paid by the owner of an eligible property to a licensed contractor for improvements, restoration, or the rehabilitation of the property or for materials used to improve, restore, or rehabilitate the property."*

The applicant provided detailed invoices from the subcontractors who performed the work and corresponding payments.

- 2) *Section 20.113(c)(1)(ii)(b) provides the following procedure: "In the case of an emergency application due to flood, fire, or natural disaster, the Commission may issue a pre-approval determination after the expenditure of qualified expenses if the Commission determines that the work requiring the Certification was done in accordance with Title 6, Subtitle 6 of this Code and is in accord with the U.S. Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines on The Rehabilitation of Historic Structures."*

Staff has reviewed the materials submitted (except for the door noted below) and finds the restoration complies with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, per 20.113 code requirements, and that the property was essentially restored to its pre-flood condition. As a result, Staff reviewed expenses submitted and finds that \$31,595.89 was spent repairing the building.

This was an emergency application due to flooding and therefore the Commission may issue a pre-approval determination after the expenditure of funds, per Section 20.113 of the Code, which states, "In the case of an emergency application due to flood, fire, or natural disaster, the Commission may issue a pre-approval determination after the expenditure of qualified expenses if the Commission determines that the work requiring the certification was done in accordance with Title 6, Subtitle 6 of this Code and is in accord with the U.S. Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines on The Rehabilitation of Historic Structures."

- 3) *Section 20.113(c)(1)(iv)(a) provides the following procedure "the owner files an application with the Commission within 12 months of the increased assessment."*

The application has been filed within the required timeframe of being submitted within a year of being re-assessed.

- 4) *Section 20.113(c)(1)(iii) provides the following procedure "A Certificate of Approval from the Commission is obtained for all work subject to Commission approval under 16.603 of this Code, or any other provision of this Code or the Zoning Regulations that requires a Commission determination."*

The style and material of the front door was changed without approval after the flood, from a wood full light door to a metal $\frac{3}{4}$ light door. An application for retroactive approval was submitted for this meeting. If the application earlier on this agenda (case HPC-20-45) was approved, then this condition has been met.

Staff Recommendation: If the retroactive application for the door was approved, then Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted for the final 20.113 tax credit, for the amount of \$31,595.89 in qualified expenses.

Testimony: Mr. Reuwer was previously sworn in. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Reuwer had any comments to add to the staff report. Mr. Reuwer said he had no comments to add.

The Commission had no questions for Mr. Reuwer.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved

HPC-20-47c – 8086 Main Street, Ellicott City

Applicant: Megan Reuwer

Request: The applicant, Megan Reuwer, requests final tax credit approval for the 20.113 assessment historic property tax credit for improvements and repairs made to 8086 Main Street, Ellicott City after the May 2018 flood.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1890. The building was damaged by the May 2018 flood and the assessment on the structure was lowered to \$1,000.00. Upon completion of the repairs, the building was re-assessed at \$130,300.00. The difference in the assessment that may be eligible for the tax credit is \$129,300.00.

Scope of Work: The Applicant seeks final tax credit approval for the assessment tax credit (Section 20.113 of the County Code) and submitted documentation that a total of \$30,009.68 was spent improving or restoring the building. The estimated potential tax credit this property could qualify for, based on the amount spent in restoration, the current assessment and the current tax rate, is \$1,311.10.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

- 1) *Section 20.113 defines qualified expenses as “the amount of money paid by the owner of an eligible property to a licensed contractor for improvements, restoration, or the rehabilitation of the property or for materials used to improve, restore, or rehabilitate the property.”*

The applicant provided detailed invoices from the subcontractors who performed the work and corresponding payments.

- 2) *Section 20.113(c)(1)(ii)(b) provides the following procedure: “In the case of an emergency application due to flood, fire, or natural disaster, the Commission may issue a pre-approval determination after the expenditure of qualified expenses if the Commission determines that the work requiring the Certification was done in accordance with Title 6, Subtitle 6 of this Code and is in accord with the U.S. Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines on The Rehabilitation of Historic Structures.”*

Staff has reviewed the materials submitted and finds the restoration complies with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, per 20.113 code requirements, and that the property was essentially restored to its pre-flood condition. As a result, Staff reviewed expenses submitted and finds that \$30,009.68 was spent repairing the building.

This was an emergency application due to flooding and therefore the Commission may issue a pre-approval determination after the expenditure of funds, per Section 20.113 of the Code, which states, “In the case of an emergency application due to flood, fire, or natural disaster, the Commission may issue a pre-approval determination after the expenditure of qualified expenses if the Commission determines that the work requiring the certification was done in accordance with Title 6, Subtitle 6 of this Code and is in accord with the U.S. Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines on The Rehabilitation of Historic Structures.”

- 3) *Section 20.113(c)(1)(iv)(a) provides the following procedure “the owner files an application with the Commission within 12 months of the increased assessment.”*

The application has been filed within the required timeframe of being submitted within a year of being re-assessed.

- 4) *Section 20.113(c)(1)(iii) provides the following procedure "A Certificate of Approval from the Commission is obtained for all work subject to Commission approval under 16.603 of this Code, or any other provision of this Code or the Zoning Regulations that requires a Commission determination."*

The style and material of the front door was changed without approval after the flood, from a wood $\frac{3}{4}$ light door with one panel to a metal $\frac{3}{4}$ light door with no paneling. An application for retroactive approval was submitted for this meeting. If the application earlier on this agenda (case HPC-20-45) was approved, then this condition has been met.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted for the final 20.113 tax credit, for the amount of \$30,009.68 in qualified expenses.

Testimony: Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Reuwer was representing the applicant. Mr. Reuwer said he was. Mr. Reuwer was previously sworn in.

The Commission had no questions for Mr. Reuwer.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-20-48c – 8129 Main Street, Ellicott City

Applicant: Donald R. Reuwer Jr.

Request: The applicant, Donald R. Reuwer Jr., requests final tax credit approval for the 20.113 assessment historic property tax credit for improvements and repairs made to 8129 Main Street, Ellicott City after the May 2018 flood.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1900. The building was damaged by the May 2018 flood and the assessment on the structure was lowered to \$1,000.00. Upon completion of the repairs, the building was re-assessed at \$175,800.00. The difference in the assessment that may be eligible for the tax credit is \$174,800.00.

Scope of Work: The Applicant seeks final tax credit approval for the assessment tax credit (Section 20.113 of the County Code) and submitted documentation that a total of \$40,149.92 was spent improving or restoring the building. The estimated potential tax credit this property could qualify for, based on the amount spent in restoration, the current assessment and the current tax rate, is \$1,772.47.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

- 1) *Section 20.113 defines qualified expenses as "the amount of money paid by the owner of an eligible property to a licensed contractor for improvements, restoration, or the rehabilitation of the property or for materials used to improve, restore, or rehabilitate the property."*

The applicant provided detailed invoices from the subcontractors who performed the work and corresponding payments.

- 2) *Section 20.113(c)(1)(ii)(b) provides the following procedure: "In the case of an emergency application due to flood, fire, or natural disaster, the Commission may issue a pre-approval determination after the expenditure of qualified expenses if the Commission determines that the work requiring the Certification was done in accordance with Title 6, Subtitle 6 of this Code and is in accord with the U.S. Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines on The Rehabilitation of Historic Structures."*

Staff has reviewed the materials submitted and finds the restoration complies with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, per 20.113 code requirements, and that the property was essentially restored to its pre-flood condition. As a result, Staff reviewed expenses submitted and finds that \$40,149.92 was spent repairing the building.

This was an emergency application due to flooding and therefore the Commission may issue a pre-approval determination after the expenditure of funds, per Section 20.113 of the Code, which states, "In the case of an emergency application due to flood, fire, or natural disaster, the Commission may issue a pre-approval determination after the expenditure of qualified expenses if the Commission determines that the work requiring the certification was done in accordance with Title 6, Subtitle 6 of this Code and is in accord with the U.S. Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines on The Rehabilitation of Historic Structures."

- 3) *Section 20.113(c)(1)(iv)(a) provides the following procedure "the owner files an application with the Commission within 12 months of the increased assessment."*

The application has been filed within the required timeframe of being submitted within a year of being re-assessed.

- 4) *Section 20.113(c)(1)(iii) provides the following procedure "A Certificate of Approval from the Commission is obtained for all work subject to Commission approval under 16.603 of this Code, or any other provision of this Code or the Zoning Regulations that requires a Commission determination."*

The material of the front door was changed without approval after the flood, from a wood full light door to a metal full light door. An application for retroactive approval was submitted for this meeting. If the application earlier on this agenda (case HPC-20-45) was approved, then this condition has been met.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted for the final 20.113 tax credit, for the amount of \$40,149.92 in qualified expenses.

Testimony: Mr. Reuwer was previously sworn in. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Reuwer had anything to add to the staff report. Mr. Reuwer said he appreciates all of staff and the Commissions help.

The Commission did not have any questions for Mr. Reuwer

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-20-49c – 8133 Main Street, Ellicott City

Applicant: Donald R. Reuwer III

Request: The applicant, Donald R. Reuwer III, requests final tax credit approval for the 20.113 assessment historic property tax credit for improvements and repairs made to 8133 Main Street, Ellicott City after the May 2018 flood.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1900. The building was damaged by the May 2018 flood and the assessment on the structure was lowered to \$1,000.00. Upon completion of the repairs, the building was re-assessed at \$181,500. The difference in the assessment that may be eligible for the tax credit is \$180,500.00.

Scope of Work: The Applicant seeks final tax credit approval for the assessment tax credit (Section 20.113 of the County Code) and has submitted documentation that a total of \$44,017.66 was spent improving or restoring the building. The estimated potential tax credit this property could qualify for, based on the amount spent in restoration, the current assessment and the current tax rate, is \$1,830.27.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

- 1) *Section 20.113 defines qualified expenses as “the amount of money paid by the owner of an eligible property to a licensed contractor for improvements, restoration, or the rehabilitation of the property or for materials used to improve, restore, or rehabilitate the property.”*

The applicant provided detailed invoices from the subcontractors who performed the work and corresponding payments.

- 2) *Section 20.113(c)(1)(ii)(b) provides the following procedure: “In the case of an emergency application due to flood, fire, or natural disaster, the Commission may issue a pre-approval determination after the expenditure of qualified expenses if the Commission determines that the work requiring the Certification was done in accordance with Title 6, Subtitle 6 of this Code and is in accord with the U.S. Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines on The Rehabilitation of Historic Structures.”*

Staff has reviewed the materials submitted and finds the restoration generally complies with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation, per 20.113 code requirements, and that the property was essentially restored to its pre-flood condition. The interior wood floor was replaced with a concrete floor as the owner believes the concrete floor is more resilient. Staff reviewed expenses submitted and finds that \$44,017.66 was spent repairing the building.




Figure 39 - Previously existing door prior to 2016 flood



Figure 40 - Damage post 2018 flood



Figure 41 - Current door

This was an emergency application due to flooding and therefore the Commission may issue a pre-approval determination after the expenditure of funds, per Section 20.113 of the Code, which states, "In the case of an emergency application due to flood, fire, or natural disaster, the Commission may issue a pre-approval determination after the expenditure of qualified expenses if the Commission determines that the work requiring the certification was done in accordance with Title 6, Subtitle 6 of this Code and is in accord with the U.S. Secretary of Interior Standards and Guidelines on The Rehabilitation of Historic Structures."

- 3) *Section 20.113(c)(1)(iv)(a) provides the following procedure "the owner files an application with the Commission within 12 months of the increased assessment."*

The application has been filed within the required timeframe of being submitted within a year of being re-assessed.

- 4) *Section 20.113(c)(1)(iii) provides the following procedure "A Certificate of Approval from the Commission is obtained for all work subject to Commission approval under 16.603 of this Code, or any other provision of this Code or the Zoning Regulations that requires a Commission determination."*

The style of the front door is different from the style that existed prior to the 2016 flood. The style of the door, shown in 2009 in Google Streetview, was a 4-light over 3 panel (horizontal) wood door. The new door is a 9-light over 2-panel (vertical) wood door. The owner is under the impression they replaced the door in-kind from the style that existed prior to the 2018 flood. After the 2016 flood, this building sat vacant for at least 9 months until the current owner purchased it. The building did not have a door after the flood and likely did not have one when purchased. The full chain of events following the 2016 flood and the subsequent sale and purchase of the building is unknown. However, the current style of door (or similar) is found on many nearby buildings and was approved by the Commission on other buildings in order to have a door put back on the building, rather than plywood, following the 2016 flood.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval as submitted for the final 20.113 tax credit, for the amount of \$44,017.66 in qualified expenses, contingent upon an application being submitted and approved for the replacement door.

Testimony: Mr. Shad said for the record Mr. Reuwer was previously sworn in. Mr. Reuwer is representing the applicant, Trae Reuwer. Mr. Reuwer said the building was owned by Craig Coyne Jewelry previously and Mr. Reuwer's son bought the building after the flood. Mr. Reuwer said the building had flooded after Hurricane Agnes and other events. Mr. Reuwer said he was not sure that anyone knew what the original door was. The building had two doors originally. Mr. Reuwer said his son put a door on the building that matched others found on Main Street.

Ms. Tennor had no questions.

Mr. Roth said the store front looked quite nice and he had no questions.

Mr. Reich said the application looked good.

Ms. Zoren and Mr. Shad had no questions.


Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to approve the application as submitted. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.


OTHER BUSINESS


Ms. Burgess reminded the Commission the July meeting would take place on July 9, 2020 instead of July 2, 2020 due to the proximity to the observance of the July 4th holiday and asked the Commission to let staff know about their attendance concerns.


Mr. Shad moved to adjourn the meeting at 10:09 pm. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

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


Allan Shad, Chair


Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary


Samantha Holmes, Preservation Planner


Kaitlyn Clifford, Recording Secretary