May Minutes

Thursday, May 5, 2022; 7:00 p.m.
A public meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, May 5, 2022. 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.

Ms. Danna moved to approve the April 7, 2022 minutes. Ms. Flynn Giles seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Members present: Allan Shad, Chair; Erica Zoren, Vice-Chair; Bruno Reich, Secretary; Julianne Danna; Ellen Flynn Giles

Staff present: Beth Burgess, Samantha Holmes, Kristen Haskins

This report and any recommendations are based on the Guidelines adopted by the Commission. The report is prepared by Commission staff and does not represent the views of the Commission or of the Department of Planning and Zoning.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

Consent Agenda
1. HPC-22-16c – 8156 Main Street, Ellicott City

Regular Agenda
2. HPC-22-17 – 8472 Hill Street, Ellicott City
3. HPC-22-18 – Corner of Fels Lane & Ellicott Mills Drive, vicinity of 3535 Ellicott Mills Drive and 3592 Fels Lane, Ellicott City
4. HPC-22-19 – 8221-8225 Main Street, Ellicott City
5. HPC-22-20 – 3725 Park Avenue, Ellicott City
6. HPC-22-21 – 3910 New Cut Road, Ellicott City
7. HPC-22-22 – 4824 Montgomery Road, Ellicott City, HO-422
8. HPC-22-23 – 6044 Trotter Road, Clarksville, HO-161

OTHER BUSINESS
1. MHT and MDOT SHA consultation process - Project No. SP122D4D the Patapsco Regional Greenway Project for the Elkridge to Guinness Connection.
2. Administrative Updates – Application forms
3. Design Guideline Update – General feedback and comments on Chapters 1, 2, 4 and Glossary.
CONSENT AGENDA

HPC-22-16c – 8156 Main Street, Ellicott City
Applicant: Master’s Ridge, LLC/Donald R. Reuwer Jr.

Request: The applicant, Master’s Ridge, LLC/Donald R. Reuwer Jr., requests final tax credit approval for the 20.113 assessment historic property tax credit for improvements and repairs made to 8156 Main Street, Ellicott City after the May 2018 flood.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. This building was constructed in 1926 for the offices of the Ellicott City Times newspaper, which were located on the second floor. 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 $315,200. The difference in the assessment that may be eligible for the tax credit is $314,200.00.

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 of $250,099.54 was spent improving or restoring the building. The estimated potential annual tax credit this property could qualify for, based on the amount spent in restoration, the current assessment and the current tax rate, is $3,185.99 a year annually for ten years.

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.”

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. Staff reviewed expenses 30% higher than the estimated potential tax credits (to account for any possible change in tax assessment rate) and finds that $44,227.56 was spent removing the damaged ceiling and flooring, and making structural repairs to joists and making other building repairs.

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.”
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.

**Staff Recommendation:** Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted for the final 20.113 tax credit, for the amount of $44,227.56 in qualified expenses.

**Testimony:** There was no testimony.

**Motion:** Ms. Flynn Giles moved to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Danna seconded. The motion was unanimously approved. Mr. Reich was absent for the vote.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

**HPC-22-17 – 8472 Hill Street, Ellicott City**

Applicant: Greg Busch

**Request:** The Applicant, Greg Busch, requests a Certificate of Approval to make exterior alterations at 8472 Hill Street, Ellicott City.

**Background and Site Description:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT, the building on the property dates to 1872.

**Scope of Work:** The Applicant proposes to make the following alterations:

1) Replace two deteriorating parking pads, increasing the size of the right pad. The pads are currently asphalt, concrete and gravel and will be paved and edged with granite cobblestones.
   a. The left parking pad, closest to the house, will be 25 feet long by 11 feet wide.
   b. A 3 feet wide landscape area will separate the two parking pads.
   c. The right parking pad will be increased in size from approximately 9 feet wide by 12 feet long to be 16 feet wide by 19 feet long.
   d. Small dry stacked stone retaining walls may be added to support the ends and corners of the pads. The walls will be approximately 1 to 2 feet in height, as needed.

2) Replace the concrete walkway on the left side of the front door with a red brick walkway and granite steps. Dry stacked stone retaining walls and a French drain may be added along the walkway to improve drainage.
Figure 1 - Google Street View image of house.

Figure 2 - Google Street View image of house and parking area.
Figure 3 - Aerial view of property.

Figure 4 - Proposed site plan.
HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

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

1) Chapter 9.D states:
   a. “Patios and walkways can be of a variety of materials. Brick and stone are common.”
   b. “Driveways are common on larger residential properties. On-street parking is used for most businesses and residences, although it is not uncommon for a driveway or parking space to be squeezed into a small front or side yard. Most residential driveways are one lane wide and constructed of gravel, asphalt or concrete. New driveways and off-street parking should be located to avoid major changes to topography, disturbance of mature trees, or other changes that alter the setting of historic buildings or streetscapes.”

2) 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.”
   c. “Where needed, install new residential driveways that are narrow (one lane) and follow the contours of the site to minimize the need for clearing and grading. If possible, locate off-street parking spaces in side or rear yards.”

The proposed alterations will utilize historic building materials and materials common to the area and property, such as the granite cobble, brick walkways and stone dry stacked retaining walls.

The proposed use of the granite cobble as the paving material for the parking pad exceeds the typical materials of gravel, asphalt or concrete and will enhance the streetscape.

The second parking pad (proposed to be enlarged), will be larger than the narrow (one lane) driveways recommended by the Guidelines, however the topography of the site does not allow for a long narrow driveway, as the hillside behind this area slopes significantly away from Hill Street toward Merryman Street. Hill Street is a very narrow street, and parking pads and driveways tucked in off the street where possible are common.

The other site improvements, such as the brick walkways, granite steps and dry stacked retaining walls comply with the Guidelines and will enhance the appearance of the house and streetscape.

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

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Greg Busch. Mr. Busch did not have any additions or corrections to the staff report. The Commissioners agreed the proposed improvements and materials, such as the granite
cobblestone, stacked stone and brick, were an improvement over the existing conditions and exceed the recommendations in the Guidelines.

**Motion:** Ms. Danna moved to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Flynn Giles seconded. The motion as unanimously approved. Mr. Reich was absent for this case.

**HPC-22-18 – Corner of Fels Lane & Ellicott Mills Drive, vicinity of 3535 Ellicott Mills Drive and 3592 Fels Lane, Ellicott City**
Applicant: EC 250, Inc.

**Request:** The Applicant, EC 250 Inc., requests a Certificate of Approval to install a sign at the corner of Fels Lane & Ellicott Mills Drive, in the vicinity of 3535 Ellicott Mills Drive and 3592 Fels Lane, Ellicott City.

**Background and Site Description:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District but does not contain any structures. This is the first parcel within the district at this location.

This application was posted as a Minor Alteration, MA-22-12, but was removed due to an objection.

**Scope of Work:** The Applicant proposes to install a gateway entrance sign at the corner of Fels Lane and Ellicott Mills Drive, as a main entry point to the historic district. The sign will match that previously approved in 1997, installed at Ellicott Mills and Main Street, near the Thomas Isaac Log Cabin. The sign will be routed wood, 3 feet high by 5 feet wide, mounted on wood posts. The sign will read “Welcome to Historic Ellicott City” and contain an image of Ellicott City above the text, which will consist of several colors.

![Figure 6 - Proposed sign.](image)

![Figure 7 - Location of proposed gateway sign on the corner of Ellicott Mills Drive and Fels Lane.](image)
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. “Use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three.”
   d. “Use historically appropriate materials such as wood or iron for signs or supporting hardware.”

The sign generally complies with the above Guidelines as it will be a routed wood sign, with the simple phrase “Welcome to Historic Ellicott City” and the year of establishment. The sign will use more than three colors. However, the colors will only be used in the image of Ellicott City and otherwise the sign will read as black and natural wood color.

**Chapter 11.B.5: Signs, Commercial Buildings, Freestanding Signs**

2) Chapter 11.B.5 states, “The Howard County Sign Code permits freestanding signs on property with at least 40 lineal feet of lot frontage. The allowed size is based on the sign’s setback from the public right-of-way. Most of Ellicott City's commercial structures are located adjacent to the sidewalk, leaving no room for a freestanding sign. Buildings that are set back from the sidewalk often do not have the minimum frontage required by the Sign Code for a freestanding sign. Therefore, freestanding signs are not common in the historic district. On property with sufficient frontage and setback, permanent freestanding signs that are scaled to be viewed by pedestrians may be appropriate.”

3) Chapter 11.B.5 recommends, “To respect the pedestrian scale, limit the size of a freestanding sign to four to six square feet in area.”

The above Guidelines are specifically geared toward freestanding commercial signs within the district. The proposed sign is gateway signage, to benefit the entire district and not just one specific business. Gateway signage is typically designed to be more visible from a vehicular scale.

**Chapter 11.D: Signs; Traffic, Directional and Other Public Signage**

4) Chapter 11.D recommends:
   a. “Use directional and informational signs conservatively, in locations that will maximize their effectiveness. Limit the number of freestanding poles to minimize streetscape clutter.”
   b. “Design signs of a particular type (e.g., all street name signs or all signs directing visitors to parking areas or public buildings) with a consistent style, lettering, size, color and logo.”
   c. “When possible, mounts sing on existing poles or poles of a traditional nature.”

The gateway sign is proposed to match that previously approved for use at Main Street and Ellicott Mills Drive, which complies with the recommendation to design signs of a particular type, i.e. gateway signage, with a consistent style, lettering, size, color and logo.

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

**Testimony:** Mr. Shad swore in Ed Lilley. Mr. Lilley did not have any additions or corrections to the staff report. Mr. Reich was in attendance for this case. The Commissioners agreed that the sign looked good, and that while there were more than three colors, the use was consistent with other approvals when
the colors are used with a graphic and do not overwhelm the sign. The Commissioners found the sign complied with the Guidelines.

Motion: Ms. Flynn Giles moved to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Zoren seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-22-19 – 8221-8225 Main Street, Ellicott City
Applicant: Kim Conley

Request: The Applicant, Kim Conley, requests a Certificate of Approval to install signs at 8221-8225 Main Street, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building on the property dates to 1930. The Design Guidelines explain that this building design was influenced by the Art Deco style through the use of the glazed terra cotta panels, steel casement windows and curved storefront. The building was originally constructed as a movie theater, and over the years has also operated as a children’s theater, performing arts space, photography studio, bookstore and retail space. The theater marquee sign still exists on the building but has been modified over the years.

The previously approved sign for Precious Gifts, was approved in 1997 (case HDC-97-36) to replace the Ellicott Theatre sign.

In March 2020, case HPC 20-07, the property owner received Advisory Comments from the Commission for the design of permanent signage on the buildings.

In April 2021, case HPC-22-13, the current Applicant received approval to install the projecting sign on the building and withdrew the request for the marquee signage, in order to look into alternative design options.

Figure 8 - Original signage, circa 1930s/40s

Figure 9 - Signage circa 1980s
Scope of Work: The Applicant resubmitted the new design options for the marquee and proposes the following:

1) Retain the two existing panels that read “ELLICOTT”.

2) On each of the changeable copy marquee boards, install:
   a. The Crazy Mason milkshake bar with milkshake graphic.
   b. Using changeable copy below to read “Flavor of the Month” with the flavor listed below.
The application states, “Per the recommendation of the board it was suggested to place channel letters above the marquee to give the appearance of the original design. Those suggested channel letters were removed a long time ago and have not been in place for several years while other tenants occupied the building. The tenant Robert Studer of The Crazy Mason is not the owner of the building and the suggested design of adding ELLICOTT in channel letters above the marquee would be cost prohibitive as he is trying to get his small business launched (The Crazy Mason). It is requested that the board accept the existing panel that is currently there now as a suitable solution.”

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. “Use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three. Coordinate sign colors with the colors used in the building façade.”

The marquee sign will contain more than three colors; however, the additional colors will only be used within the milkshake graphic; which covers a small portion of the sign. Otherwise the text will be white with black outline on the marquee sign, black lettering for the changeable copy and red lettering for the term “milkshake bar.”

The panel reading “ELLICOTT” was installed without approval for the previous business use in the building. The “ELLICOTT” text appears to be gray with a black background. The Applicant proposes to retain the “ELLICOTT” panel. The Commission should determine if the sign colors appear coordinated with the existing colors of the building façade and the proposed marquee sign.

2) 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 marquee sign involves the re-use of a historic sign on the building. The Applicant proposes to retain the existing panel reading “ELLICOTT,” as the suggestion to use channel letters to restore the original sign is cost prohibitive.

Chapter 11.B: Signs, Commercial Buildings

3) Chapter 11.B recommends, “incorporate the sign into the façade of the building. Sign should fit within the lines and panels of the façade as defined by the building frame and architectural details.”

4) For flat mounted signs, Chapter 11.B recommends, “In most cases, limit the area of signage to one-half square foot of sign area for each linear foot of primary street frontage, with a limit of eight square feet in area for any one sign. More sign area is appropriate for some of Ellicott City's larger buildings, where these limits would result in signs that are ineffective or not in scale with the building.”

The marquee sign fits within the existing theater marquee, and as a result is larger than typically recommended for flat mounted signs. The proposed signage will fit within the changeable copy marquee area.
5) Chapter 11.A recommends, “Emphasize the identification of the establishment rather than an advertising message on the face of the sign.”
6) Chapter 11.A states the following is Routine Maintenance, “Restoring or repairing a sign with materials that exactly match the existing materials; changing only the text of a sign while all else remains the same.”

The marquee area will utilize 6” changeable letters in a serif style font, similar to what has previously been on the marquee. The business owner would be able to change out the message as routine maintenance per Chapter 11.A. While this is advertising and the Guidelines typically recommend against it, the proposal is consistent with the historical use of the theater marquee to advertise movies.

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

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Robert Studer and Luis Quintana. Mr. Studer explained they looked at the channel marquee signs at the recommendation of the Commission, but they were estimated to cost between $10,000 to $20,000. Mr. Studer would like to retain the current Ellicott sign panel and update the marquee with the Crazy Mason logo and changeable copy below. They took to heart the recommendation to restore the marquee to a 1930s style. The marquee would be restored to have LED lighting behind to appear like a lit sign from the 1930s.

The Commission discussed the proposed use of the “ELLICOTT” panel to determine if it complied with the Guidelines. Mr. Studer said his proposed alternative was to remove the current “ELLICOTT” over the cabinet, but keep the cabinet which has historical value and is changeable copy that was previously there, and leave it like that without the “ELLICOTT” over it. Ms. Flynn Giles understands the concern that the ELLICOTT sign was not approved initially. She does not want ELLICOTT gone and thought it was important having the reference back.

Ms. Danna said the main marquee was a large improvement. She did not find that the Ellicott sign complied with the Guidelines based on the material and being backlit. Ms. Flynn Giles said the second marquee board is comparable to the HPC advice from April meeting and is comfortable with the sign.

Mr. Reich said the Applicant did a good job incorporating their comments and he found this to be a good compromise as leaving the “ELLICOTT” mimics what was there before. He said it does not take over Main Street just for one business sign and attempts to come close to the 1930s sign. Ms. Zoren said that in the absence of channel letters, this was their next best option to leave “ELLICOTT” there. She did not want to see changeable type or a metal panel there. The Commission hoped there could be a future opportunity for channel letters and that the building owner would undertake the project.

Mr. Reich confirmed the marquee sign below will be backlit with LED. Mr. Quintana said it is a Lexan face and there are currently old bulbs that will be retrofitted with LED. The changeable copy is on a track system, similar to how movie theaters used to change the sign. Mr. Reich asked how bright the LED will be. Mr. Reich said it should not be an intense spotlight. Mr. Quintana said a dimmer switch could be installed to bring down the lumens. Ms. Holmes asked if the bulb would be a soft white/yellow or a bright white/blue LED. Mr. Quintana said the light would be a brighter white. Ms. Zoren said the main marquee design is in line with what they suggested. She said they are not looking for a bright neon glow, but are looking to mimic the old theater lights. She said it would not be appropriate for it to be a bright neon glow.

Mr. Studer said the dimmer switch was a good idea to include, he agreed with that recommendation.
Ms. Zoren asked when the light would come on. Mr. Quintana said it would be a timer where it would turn on at sundown and run for a few hours.

Mr. Shad agreed with the previous comments. He said the changes made in the marquee sign were in accord with the previous discussion. Mr. Shad agreed dimmer controlled lighting levels should be incorporated into the motion.

**Motion:** Ms. Flynn Giles moved to approve the application with the stipulation that the LED lighting behind the changeable copy be controlled with a dimmer and that a nighttime timer be included. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**HPC-22-20 – 3725 Park Avenue, Ellicott City**

Applicant: George Tolen

**Request:** The Applicant, George Tolen, requests a Certificate of Approval for retroactive alterations as 3725 Park Avenue, Ellicott City.

**Background and Site Description:** This building is located in the Ellicott City Historic District and is listed on the Howard County Historic Sites Inventory as HO-285, the Weir House/Ellicott’s Second School Building. The building dates circa 1812.

In April 2021, case HPC-21-13, the Applicant was approved to remove the addition of a roof extension over the rear porch (facing Court Avenue), the cedar shingle exterior walls and corresponding windows in order to expose the original façade, which contains a mansard roof and windows. This work is currently in progress and the Applicant will return with additional information in order to complete the project as the current work progresses (the HPC approved the application, with the final finish work subject to HPC approval as more information was required by the Commission in order to make a determination).

**Scope of Work:** The Applicant seeks retroactive approval for the completion of the finish work that was not accessible or visible at the time of the initial application in HPC-21-13. This HPC-21-13 case to remove the sleeping porch in order to expose the mansard was approved, but the finish work and other non-visible work to join the two rooflines together was left subject to a future approval.

![Figure 14 - Current conditions](image-url)
Figure 15 – Photo from original April 2021, HPC-21-13 application, mansard roof and window covered by second floor porch enclosure.

Figure 16 – Photo from original April 2021 (HPC-21-13) application - enclosed area and roof extension proposed to be removed.

Figure 17 – Photo from original April 2021 application - Side wall to be removed where attached to shingle roof. End windows showing how the porch enclosure was added.

Figure 18 – From April 2021, HPC-21-13 application, section of porch. Highlight showing the enclosure to be removed to expose mansard roof.
The application states:
“Under a previous application the Howard County Historical Society was granted approval to remove a sleeping porch built over the lower porch on the south side of 3725 Park Avenue. At the time of this application, we were unable to provide details of how we proposed to finish the corners where the front sloped roof would meet the stone sidewalk as this had been enclosed when the porch was constructed.

Subsequent demolition shows that the stone side wall terminates at the same angle as the roof and that the original roof sheathing extends to cover the end of the stone wall.”

The application explains that photo 3 from the application “shows the final closure at the end of the roof and how it is attached to the existing horizontal frieze board at the bottom of the cedar siding. It also shows a 5” ogee moulding at the soffit that was milled to match a short piece found during the demolition. All trim is shown in white primer but will be painted off white to match what is currently on the balance of the building. A 5” half round gutter will be installed on the exposed soffit.”

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 6.J: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Cornices and Ornamentation

1) Chapter 6.J recommends:
   a. “Replace missing original features that can be documented by physical evidence, photographs or other means.”
   b. “Uncover original details obscured by later additions.”

2) Chapter 6.J recommends against, “decorating a building by adding trim that did not exist on it historically.”

The Commission wanted to see the proposed construction solution to joining the two rooflines together and what the trim/finish detail would look like. The Applicant submitted an application in January 2022, but Staff requested additional information to complete the application. The Applicant withdrew and submitted an application after the work was completed. Chapter 6.J offers some recommendations for trim/cornice detailing, as shown above.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC determine if the alterations comply with the Guidelines and approve, modify or deny accordingly.

Testimony: Ms. Flynn Giles recused herself from the case. Mr. Shad swore in George Tolen. Mr. Tolen did not have anything to add or correct to the staff report.

Mr. Reich said the building looked beautiful and the building has regained its original grandeur. Mr. Reich thought the application should be approved. Ms. Zoren understood the reason for the retroactive approval need, as it was unknown conditions and they had Advisory Comments to move forward with. The Commissioners agreed the application and project looked good. Mr. Shad agreed with the previous comments and applauded their efforts to uncover the building.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Danna seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.
**HPC-22-21 – 3910 New Cut Road, Ellicott City**

Applicant: Bryan R. Moody, Howard County Department of Recreation and Parks

**Request:** The Applicant, Howard County Department of Recreation and Parks, requests a Certificate of Approval to demolish a building at 3910 New Cut Road, Ellicott City.

**Background and Site Description:** This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to the Historic Sites Inventory form, the structure dates circa 1941-1942.

---

**Figure 19 - Front facade of house.**

**Figure 20 - Side and rear view of house.**
Scope of Work: The Applicant proposes to demolish the existing house and two outbuildings in order to return the land to open space and implement future stream restoration parallel to New Cut Road.

The application states:

“This structure was purchased by the County in April, 2021, using State of Maryland Program Open Space funds. The County acquired the land to increase the amount of open space in and around the Ellicott City area, and proposes to raze the structure, returning the land to natural conditions through reforestation with native species. The County has no need for this structure. New Cut Road is designated a Scenic Road, and removal of the structure and proposed reforestation will promote the scenic qualities of the road.

This structure sets on the outer boundary of the Ellicott City Historic District. The County’s Architectural Historian has completed a survey and Maryland Inventory of Historic Places (MIHP) documentation of this structure; and the MIHP documentation / recordation is proposed as the mitigation measure for the impact to the structure. The MIHP documentation has been submitted to the Maryland Historic Trust (MHT). While the County feels that no other mitigation measures are necessary for this structure removal, the County will endeavor to salvage reusable building materials, if deemed economically viable. Worth noting, a hazardous material assessment of the structure has been completed and the structure contains numerous suspected asbestos containing and other regulated hazardous materials which will be abated prior to demolition of the structure.”

After demolition, the Applicant proposes to grade the site to natural contours and reforest the site with native species. The application lists the following trees to be planted:

(5) Red Maple, 5-7 gallon, 6-8’
(5) Eastern Red Bud, 5-7 gallon, 5-6’
(5) Chestnut Oak, 5-7 gallon, 6-8’
(5) Black Locust, 5 gallon, 5-6’
(5) Tulip Poplar, 5 gallon, 5-6’

The Applicant asserts that this structure is not a Structure of Unusual Importance and provides several reasons, including:

A. “While the siting of the structure is representative of the development of the outer portions of the Historic District, the structure itself is not of particularly unusual character. Citing of the structure is generally not readily visible from the public way nor any other structure in the district, therefore its removal would not greatly impact the integrity of the District.

a. As noted in the MIHP documentation, the structure was likely constructed c. 1940’s and therefore was constructed post the District’s period of significance.

b. Furthermore, the MIHP documentation notes that the structure was constructed of salvaged materials from other structures, likely indicative of the availability of materials around the time of its construction. Many of these materials are in poor condition and have been augmented through contemporary repairs as noted.

c. The form of the structure, as identified in the documentation, is a Cape Cod structure. This is a relatively common residential form, and the shape/form of this particular structure is not unique or atypical.”


**HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:**

**Demolition of Existing Structures**

*Ellicott City Historic District Design Guidelines; Chapter 12: Demolition and Relocation*

Chapter 12 states, “Demolition and relocation of any structure requires a Certificate of Approval from the Historic Preservation Commission. This requirement applies to structures such as retaining walls, sheds and garages as well as houses. Historic buildings are irreplaceable resources. Because their demolition will have a permanent detrimental effect on the historic district, the Commission will consider approving demolition only after all possible alternatives to preserve the structure are exhausted.”

Section 300 of the Commission’s Rules of Procedure provides information on the process for reviewing applications for demolitions in the historic district. The entire section is relevant to this application, and is incorporated by reference. Please refer to the Rules of Procedure for full text.

**Rules of Procedure, Section 302, Demolition and Relocation of Structures in Historic Districts; Classification of Structure**

1) Section 302 states, “Before acting on an application for demolition or relocation, the Commission shall determine whether the structure is a Structure of Unusual Importance. Structures of Unusual Importance are structures deemed by the Commission to be of unusual importance to the Nation, State or County, whose loss would cause great damage to the character and integrity of the historic district. Determination that a structure is a Structure of Unusual Importance shall be based on criteria in its adopted guidelines, the testimony of expert witnesses or other documentary evidence presented to the Commission.

The historic house dates circa 1941-1942. The one shed appears to be a modern structure, while the second shed is in ruins.

**Rules of Procedure, Section 304, Demolition and Relocation of Structures in Historic Districts; Demolition of Other Structures**

1) Section 304 of the Commission’s Rules of Procedures state, “If the Commission determines that the structure is not a Structure of Unusual Importance, it shall vote to approve or deny the application based on the standards set forth in §16.607 of the Howard County Code and its adopted Guidelines.
Section 16.607 – Standards for Review.
(a) Elements for Consideration. In reviewing an application for a certificate of approval, the Commission shall give consideration to:

1. The historic, architectural, or archeological value or significance of the structure and its relationship to historic value of the surrounding area.
2. The relationship of the exterior architectural features of such structure to the remainder of the structure and to the surrounding area.
3. The general compatibility of exterior design, scale, proportion, arrangement, texture and materials proposed to be used.
4. Whether the requested action is necessary to protect against threats to public safety.
5. Any other factors, including aesthetic factors, which the Commission deems to be pertinent.

If the Commission determines the structures are not of Unusual Importance, the process to be followed is described in Section 304 of the Rules of Procedure, under Demolition of Other Structures. Section 304.A states that if the Commission determines the structure is not a Structure of Unusual Importance, they shall vote to approve or deny the application based on the standards in Section 16.607 of the Howard County Code and its adopted Guidelines. An excerpt from Section 16.607 is provided above.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC determine if the 1940s era house and two sheds are Structures of Unusual Importance.

a. If the Commission determines the 1940s era house and two sheds are not of Unusual Importance, Staff recommends the HPC vote to approve or deny the demolition based on the standards set forth in §16.607 of the Howard County Code and its adopted Guidelines.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Bryan Moody. Mr. Moody did not have anything to add or correct to the staff report.

The Commission deliberated on whether the house was a structure of unusual importance. Ms. Flynn Giles asked the Commissioners if there was anything else that would tell them the structure was of unusual importance. She did not see any evidence to make her think it was of unusual importance. Mr. Reich said the Inventory reports do not indicate anything, and that it was a typical 1940s Cape Cod that was not in bad condition. Mr. Reich said he did not think it was of unusual importance, there was not a historic event that took place, it was not an unusual artifact to be preserved or part of an important streetscape. He did not think it fit the category of unusual importance. He said the County needed to remove it as part of the practice of keeping the community safe, stormwater management and restore to its natural state. Mr. Reich said it looks to be in sound structural condition and appeared to have original siding and not modernized.

Ms. Danna found it was a structure of historical significance and said there are very few sites interpreted in Ellicott City of black history. She said New Cut Road was an area where the black population was pushed to the outskirts of town. She thought it would be a good place for resident curatorship program if fixed up to be a safe structure. She said the history from the Inventory shows the owner was a possibly college educated black man of the time. He was a professional who was associated with a lot of other high standing professionals of the time. She would argue that if they were to preserve the mill buildings and other smaller storefronts, she does not think they can say this is not a structure of significance. She understood it would take work to bring the building up to standards if used for residential. She noted that the Inventory form stated that while the house was not individually eligible for the National...
Register, it would be considered a contributing building to the National Register District if the period of significance was updated.

Ms. Zoren agreed with Ms. Danna’s comments, but said it was hard to call it a structure of unusual importance. She agreed it was an important structure and they need to discuss whether it is appropriate for demolition or not, but noted that was separate from discussing unusual importance. She said it is important to note the historic value of this African American community, which is well documented and not as represented as the building on Main Street. She did not think it was unusually important due to the condition of the building and the changes over the years.

Mr. Shad agreed that the building in its current condition and age was not a structure of unusual importance.

Mr. Reich asked if this was just being removed for open space or if it was needed for flood control. Mr. Moody confirmed DRP purchased the land for open space and that DPW may use the front of the property for stream improvements. Mr. Moody said they would raze the structure and convert the dry land to natural contours and reforestation.

Mr. Reich agreed with Ms. Danna’s comments. He said they have been presented with a picture-perfect Cape Cod and it could be a nice addition to Ellicott City and it has a well-documented local history behind it.

Mr. Moody said that program open space funding prohibits residential use of the property.

Ms. Danna provided some other history that was in the Inventory form, such as the reuse of building materials as part of the Great Depression and found it was of unusual importance because it tells a story not frequently told.

**Motion for Structure of Unusual Importance:** Mr. Reich moved to find the structure was a structure of unusual importance. Ms. Danna seconded. Ms. Zoren, Mr. Reich and Ms. Danna voted to find the structure was of unusual importance and Mr. Shad and Ms. Flynn Giles voted against the motion. The motion passed 3 to 2, that the structure is of unusual importance.

Ms. Danna moved that the two sheds are not of unusual importance. Ms. Flynn Giles seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**Testimony:** The Commission reviewed Section 303 of the Rules of Procedure for the procedure for structures of unusual importance. Mr. Reich said they have not heard any evidence to item C, interest in a majority of the community; or B, financial hardship; A, being a deterrent to a major improvement program of substantial benefit to the County. Mr. Reich did not see the open space as a major improvement program as demolition of the house would only allow for a small amount of extra open space.

Ms. Flynn Giles said in regards to financial hardship DRP bought it with Maryland Open Space funds and it cannot be a residence. She found it to be a hardship. Mr. Reich said the applicant has not presented any evidence to that effect. Mr. Reich said that just because the building cannot be used for a residence, does not mean it cannot be used for something else, such as being part of a park program.

Mr. Moody said it would be a burden because the funds they purchased the property with do not allow for a residence and the County would need to make improvements or programming to permit access. Ms. Danna pointed out that the County should have come to the Commission for Advisory Comments prior to purchasing the property.
Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Moody would like to withdraw the application or continue it to next month in order to provide more information. Mr. Moody said he would like to continue to the next meeting.

**Motion:** The application was continued to the June 2 meeting.

**HPC-22-22 – 4824 Montgomery Road, Ellicott City, HO-422**

Applicant: Avoca Manor, LLC

**Request:** The Applicant, Avoca Manor, LLC, requests Advisory Comments regarding historic trees at 4824 Montgomery Road, Ellicott City.

**Background and Site Description:** The property, which consists of 5.355 acres, is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-422, Avoca. The property is zoned R-20. The development will create 8 buildable lots and retain four historic structures.

The Inventory forms state that “the main block and the first story of the middle section of the ell were constructed first, in 1838, and the second story of the middle section and the rear of the ell were added, probably c. 1877-78.” The house was constructed by Dr. Michael Pue and sold upon his death in 1877 to Alfred V. Thomas, when it was enlarged.

The Inventory form provides the following description of the existing setting:

“Avoca” is located at 4824 Montgomery Road, about two miles south of Ellicott City, in northeastern Howard County, Maryland. The house faces northeast toward the road and is set well back from the road, with a straight drive in along the northwest side of the house. The property is bounded on the northwest by Avoca Avenue and on the southwest by Knoll Glen Road. The lot is generally flat and is heavily wooded on the northeast half, with the house set in a clearing. There is a line of stone outbuildings along the drive to the rear of the house, consisting of a stone smokehouse with ruins of another structure attached, a stone outbuilding of undetermined use, and two small stone sheds that likely sheltered livestock.”

The Historic Sites Inventory form contains the following information regarding landscape elements:

“In May, 1858 a tornado ripped through this section of Howard County doing considerable damage to Dr. Pue’s new farm. A local correspondent noted: "At Dr. Pue's the hurricane swept down in a moment a fine modern barn, 100 feet long and 58 feet wide, scattering the fragments like driftwood over acres of ground; the ice-house was blown from its site, and the carriage-house blown down, as were the chimneys of the extensive stone mansion, together with all the fruit and shade trees and fencing.”

In October 2020, in case HPC-20-733, the Applicant received Advisory comments on the design of the subdivision, which will retain the historic house. The specimen Bald Cypress tree, ST-15, is located on proposed Lot 3 and has a DBH of 43-inches and a critical root zone of 64.5 feet. The Commission recommended against the removal of this specimen tree, noting the tree was a significant tree that was part of the historic setting and should be retained.

**Scope of Work:** The current plan submitted to the HPC lists all specimen trees and trees 10-inches or larger. Details about each tree’s estimated age, condition, diameter and circumference measured at breast height and the potential historic significance are included as well. As requested by the Department of Planning and Zoning, the Applicant is seeking advice from the Commission on the historic significance of the trees.
The plan submitted contains 15 specimen trees and 72 trees with a DBH of 10-29.9 inches. Of the 72 trees with a DBH of 10-29.9 inches, the Applicant has identified 14 trees with potential historic significance.

The specimen tree list contains 15 specimen trees, including the 43-inch DBH bald cypress the HPC previously provided comments on, finding it to be of historic significance as it contributes to the historic setting of the historic house and historic outbuildings. The application also contains a specimen tree assessment, in which 6 trees were further assessed. This document provides photographs, condition notes and an approximate age for Trees 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 15, as stated in the updated Breen Specimen Tree Assessment prepared for Eco-Science Professional, Inc. by Myra Brosius, an exhibit submitted with the application package.

**HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:**

The update to the Howard County Forest Conservation Manual established new standards for identifying historic trees. It recognized that in addition to specimen trees with a 30” DBH or greater, understory tree species with a 10” DBH or greater or other trees that that contribute to the historic view or setting of a historic structure could have historic significance as well.

Specifically, Section 2.2.5 of the Forest Conservation Manual, describes historic trees as follows:

“Historic trees are part of an historic site and contribute to a significant view or setting, or they are associated with an historic structure. Large hardwoods, such as oaks, poplars and hickories, that have historic significance are often also specimen trees, with a DBH of 30 inches or greater. Smaller understory trees, such as dogwoods, sourwoods and redbuds, naturally have a smaller DBH and usually do not qualify as a specimen tree. To ensure smaller trees with historic significance are not overlooked, data must also be collected on understory trees with a DBH of 10 inches or greater on historic sites or sites with historic structures.”

Section 16.606(d) of the County Code states that the Commission shall provide advice on historic resources and identify all historic resources on a site. While the HPC did previously provide advice on the site development plan in case HPC-20-73 and provided Advisory Comments on a few specimen trees, the Commission had not been asked specifically for Advisory Comments on the historic significance of all 15 specimen trees and other understory species or historic trees that have a 10” DBH or greater.

Therefore, it is requested for the HPC to review the tree table (tree list) on the site plan and provide advice on which trees, if any, should be considered historic. This advice will be forwarded to a Committee of Department Heads from the Department of Planning and Zoning, Office of Community Sustainability and the Department of Recreation and Parks, who will use this advice to determine which trees require a waiver for removal or should be protected as outlined in the Forest Conservation Manual.

Below are preliminary criteria the HPC may consider for determining which trees may have historic significance; however, the HPC may have other criteria for consideration.

- Size and species of the tree
- Affiliated with the historic structure or related to a significant historic person or event
- Part of a significant or intentional design like formal gardens, an orchard or an allee along a driveway or road
- Have a minimum age
**Staff Recommendation to the HPC:** Staff recommends the HPC provide advice on the historic significance of the trees.

**Testimony:** Mr. Shad swore in Samer Alomer and John Canoles. Mr. Alomer said they received Advisory Comments in October 2020, but now they need to receive comments on the historic significance of trees 10 inches or larger. He explained they started working on the project in 2020 and said they worked with the HPC to provide the best layout. He said they lost two lots, in order to maximize the area around the historic structure. Lot 1, containing the historic structure, will be 3 acres.

Mr. Reich asked if the submitted plan would be subdivided. Mr. Alomer said it will be subdivided, but the plan provided shows the initial parcel as it stands now. Mr. Alomer said that nothing has changed on the lot layout from 2020. Mr. Alomer screen shared the lot layout plan and Mr. Reich asked if the trees crossed out are trees to be removed. Mr. Alomer said that was correct. Mr. Reich said that most of the specimens to be removed were marked in poor condition and asked if that was correct. Mr. Canoles said the trees with the red X are not specimen trees, they are trees between 10 and 29.9 inches that they have identified for removal. For the specimen trees they are retaining 10 specimen trees and there are currently 15. Mr. Reich asked their condition. Mr. Canoles said they are in fair to poor condition and discussed which ones were native.

Mr. Reich said the context of the historic house is what the Historic Preservation Commission would look for. He said they are saving specimen trees around the house and it is otherwise lawn area. He said it looks like they have done a good job with preserving as much of it as possible.

Ms. Flynn Giles said she appreciated the amount of work that was done to look at the trees, and the criteria provided such as the health; specifically looking at the trees that support the sense of the historic house, its history and appearance; the description of the identification of what was a canopy tree or not and the identification of the native species versus non-native. She found they fit within the criteria established for the historic assessment of the trees.

Ms. Zoren agreed and appreciated having a knowledgeable specialist in their field. She said it was very thorough and it appears they are saving 10 out of the 15 specimen trees, which is impressive in a new subdivision plan.

Ms. Danna was most concerned about the gingkoes, since the HPC needs to weigh in on whether the trees were planted purposefully by the original owners. She discussed ST2, the specimen ginkgo versus another gingko by Knoll Glen Road. Mr. Canoles said the ginkgo by Knoll Glen is a female that produces a lot of seed, and it was possible to be a volunteer or planted. Ms. Danna asked if the T2 Ginkgo was being removed. Mr. Canoles said it was being retained. She said she has seen many ginkgoes planted purposefully.

Mr. Shad asked about the Bald Cypress Specimen Tree #15 and said in October 2020 the Commission determined it was a significant tree, part of the historic setting and should be retained. Mr. Alomer agreed with the classification of the tree and its importance. He said they reduced the lot sizes and maximized the area around the house. He said it is the only specimen tree in better condition than the other trees but it is the one tree they cannot save. He said they will try to save it in the field, but they will be disturbing more than 40% of the critical root zone, so they have identified it as to be removed.

Mr. Shad referenced the three groupings of Kentucky Coffee tree, ST8, 9, and 10. He asked why ST8 and ST 10 are being removed. Mr. Alomer said they work with the limit of disturbance and they have tightened it as close as they can to the houses. He said they calculate the critical root zone disturbance
for each tree and the trees were 33% and 34% and anything above 30% is assumed not to survive construction.

Ms. Holmes asked the Commissioners to specifically comment on which trees they find to be of significance, regardless of whether or not they were to be retained or removed. Mr. Shad said he would consider ST15 to be a significant loss and would consider ST15 to be historically significant based on the setting with the house and its size.

Mr. Canoles said they will need to get an Alternative Compliance for the removal of any of the specimen trees. He thought a question for the Commission would be whether or not the Commission found any of the trees less than 30 inches to be a historical significance, which would then require an Alternative Compliance request to remove.

The Commission discussed various timeframes and criteria to determine what makes a tree historic. Mr. Reich suggested the trees that are important for historic significance would have provided context for the house, versus something in a forest. He found the trees close to the house like tree 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and around the front yard like tree 70, 68, 67, 66, 65 could perhaps have significance as they frame the house. Mr. Reich mentioned a 150-year-old black cherry as being historic, but Mr. Canoles said that tree is being removed and he did not consider it historic since it is a canopy tree.

Ms. Danna suggested finding that all trees over 100 years old are historically significant given the time period of the house.

Mr. Alomer thought most of the trees around the house are being preserved and they are canopy trees.

Mr. Reich said that Mr. Canoles has identified what he, Mr. Canoles, believes is a historic understory tree, marked in green. Mr. Reich thought the Commission should determine if they agree with that or not. Mr. Canoles said the forest conservation manual specifies it should be understory trees between 10 and 30 inches, which is why the cherries and some other trees were not marked as historic.

Mr. Canoles said red cedars were used historically in a hedgerow, such as along a driveway. He said on this site they appear naturally occurring, not put in intentionally.

Mr. Reich said the #70 Gingko will remain and the status of a few other trees. Mr. Reich agreed with the trees identified as potential historic understory. Ms. Flynn Giles agreed that the assessment provided by the experts was sufficient and she accepted the list identified by the Applicant. Ms. Danna and Ms. Zoren concurred. Mr. Shad reiterated his concern for keeping ST 15.

**Motion:** There was no motion as the case was for Advisory Comments.

**HPC-22-23 – 6044 Trotter Road, Clarksville, HO-161**

**Applicant:** Leah Penza

**Request:** The Applicant, Leah Penza, requests Advisory Comments for the site and building alterations at 6044 Trotter Road, Clarksville.

**Background and Site Description:** This property is not located in the Historic District, but is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-161, the Henry Warfield/John L. Due House. The property consists of
33.69 acres and is zoned R-ED, Residential: Environmental Development. The property is encumbered with a Maryland Environmental Trust Easement. According to the Historic Sites Inventory form, the historic house dates to 1836.

The historic buildings on the property consist of the main historic house, historic smokehouse, cottage (historically a summer kitchen), historic spring house, historic corn crib and a modern barn that incorporates within it a historic log granary.

The County Architectural Historian provided the following historical information on the significance of the property:

Five Warfield brothers moved out of Old Frederick Road and settled in the area of present-day Lisbon. One of them, Azel, had his estate to the south of Lisbon. Azel’s son, Henry, purchased 65 acres of the estate from his mother in 1828 for $1,200, added a small 9-acre parcel in 1831, and later purchased 80 acres of the estate from his mother and two brothers in 1834 for $1,000. With his farm assembled, he was ready to build a substantial dwelling that would illustrate to others that he had arrived, and he did this in 1836, constructing the main block of the stone farmhouse. A previous survey of the house stated that the kitchen ell dated to the eighteenth century and the main block was added to it; however, the physical evidence clearly shows that the ell was added to the 1836 house. The construction of both is identical and suggests that there was an earlier dwelling where the ell was, that the main block was added to it, and as soon as the main block was complete, the family moved into it and the old house was taken down and replaced with the ell...The farm passed out of the Warfield family in 1931.

The house has had a number of changes on the interior to make it appear older than it actually is, including the addition of chair rail and crown mouldings, and the replacement of all of the mantels with earlier, historic ones. However, the original mantels appear to be stored in outbuildings on the property, and much original material remains in the house, including the windows. The log granary is of major significance and is now subsumed within a modern pole barn that has protected it. This represents a very rare survival and illustrates the changing agricultural patterns of Howard County from tobacco to grain. Also of significance are the line of outbuildings running off to the east from the kitchen ell: a stone smokehouse, log kitchen, and, further down the hill, a stone springhouse. Few farms retain this complete a collection of outbuildings.

The Commission provided Advisory Comments on the main house addition in November 2019 in case HPC-19-53. In May 2021, in case HPC-21-15, the Applicant returned to the Commission for additional Advisory Comments as the owners sought a zoning variance to demolish the historic smokehouse, salvage the stone for re-use and rebuild and increase the building footprint by 100 square feet. Originally the Applicant planned to reinforce and re-use the stone smokehouse, remove the frame addition and build a new frame addition. The current application states this building was restored, but this building was demolished and reconstructed reusing some of the historic materials.

The visible barn does not contain any historic significance, but it subsumes within it a log granary (with frame additions on either end) that comprises the upper left quarter of the building. This is a very rare survival and was helped, in part, because it was protected by the current barn building. Additional information is available in the updated Inventory form.

Scope of Work: The Applicant now seeks Advisory Comments on further site alterations, which may trigger Site Development Plan review through DPZ, in addition to request for a Zoning Variance on the
accessory structure height limitation and accessory structure lot coverage. The application states, “The renovation to the interior of the existing house has recently been completed by the current owners, and an addition was constructed containing a new kitchen, laundry, mud room, one car garage, and partial master suite. For the remaining garage spaces needed for the family and to finalize the master suite, we are proposing a 2-story stone addition with a gable roof perpendicular to the existing addition. The new addition will respect the historical character of the existing house yet allow for the needs of the growing family. Major materials that key from the existing house include stone, architectural slate-style shingles, and historically appropriate Hardie Plank Lap siding.”

The application states that the existing corn crib and barn are in need of significant renovation and states, “The corn crib is a simple structure with a standing seam gable roof and board and batten siding. It no longer serves a purpose to the site besides informal parking and non-secure storage. As part of the master planning process, it was decided to locate a future swimming pool in a remote location on the property, and the location of the corn crib suggested that this outbuilding could best be adaptively reused to serve as a pool house. Due to the structural system creating small spaces within the building along with decades of decayed wood and inadequate foundations, there is no practical way to utilize the existing structure. We propose to reconstruct the building where it will function as a pool house with essentially the same massing, rooflines, fenestration, and materials. To the extent possible, materials such as the stone and existing awning shutters with be reused. This will provide a safer and better use for an unusable building and give access to the restored beautiful views the property has to offer.”

Regarding the barn, the application states: “The existing barn is another structure that serves no useful purpose due to its configuration of low rooflines, lack of stable foundations, decay and structural limitations. It is a very prominent structure when entering the property via the driveway making its decayed state in conflict with the estate. The building is connected to a large formal rose garden with terraced stone retaining walls and a centered walkway, yet the building has no architectural connection to the garden. Like the corn crib, the location of the building has the potential to take advantage of commanding views of the property. We propose to reconstruct this structure with a foundation and modern structural systems yet with the same historical character of the manor home, outbuildings, and landscape. This reconstruction will provide proper secure storage, access to the views & stronger architectural presence. The existing materials include reused stone from the barn, similar board and batten siding, and a standing seam roof.”
Figure 24 - Current property and site conditions.

Figure 25 - Front facade of historic house.
HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

The Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation

1) Standard 1 states: “A property shall be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to its distinctive materials, features, spaces and spatial relationships.”

2) Standard 2 states: “The historic character of a property shall be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces and spatial relationships that characterize a property shall be avoided.”

3) Standard 6 states: “Deteriorated historic features shall be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature shall match the old in design, color, texture and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features shall be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.”

4) Standard 9 states: “New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction shall not destroy historic materials, features and spatial relationships that characterize the property. The new work shall be differentiated from the old and shall be compatible with the historic materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.”

5) Standard 10 states: “New additions and adjacent or related new construction shall be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment would be unimpaired.”

The above Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation seem most applicable to the historic property and proposed projects and are provided for the Commission’s review. This project proposes to alter the design and layout of the addition to the main historic house and alter the corn crib and barn (the visible barn does not contain any historic significance, but it subsumes within it a log granary with frame additions on either end that comprises the upper left quarter of the building). Most proposed alterations are not reversible as buildings will be deconstructed and reconstructed, with a combination of modern and some salvaged materials to be used in the construction of new buildings.

The Applicant is seeking a Zoning Variance on the accessory structure height limitation and accessory structure lot coverage.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC provide guidance on the construction of the new structures, additions and site alterations.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in James Foster, Leah Penza and Jeffrey Penza. Ms. Penza said they wanted to bring the property to its full potential and while the buildings have historic value, they do not provide any value to the property themselves. The barn and corn crib are structurally deteriorating and cannot be used for any other purpose because of the specific layouts and the structures that were intended for their original purposes, they do not provide any usable space.

Mr. Reich asked where the buildings they are taking down are located on the plans. Ms. Penza explained the site plans that show the overall property. The barn is the southern most building on the property, directly on access with the driveway into the house. Ms. Penza said they will take those buildings down and replace new structures in the same location. She said the barn footprint will be shifted slightly to create a connection centered to the center walkway in a rose garden. Ms. Penza said there is also an addition to the house. Ms. Penza explained the history of the submission, as they received Advisory on an addition by the HPC a few years ago. She noted the building was originally a very long structure, perpendicular to the historic house and that they rotated the building addition because the mass did not
seem to be appropriate with the scale and size of the house. Mr. Reich said it looked like there was a conscientious effort to blend the addition in and make it compatible with the existing house.

Ms. Penza said there was no way to reuse the corn crib, as there are no windows and there is not much to the building, so they proposed to take a lot of the materials, such as the awning shutters, and reuse them. The new construction will keep the shape and massing and create something more usable. Mr. Reich confirmed they would rebuild something entirely new with the existing materials. He said it did not make sense to not just adapt it. Mr. Foster said there was no foundation in any of the buildings, in the barn or the corn crib. And like the other historic structures on site, they plan to deconstruct, clean off stone and cut them for reuse or reuse the wood in the new structures. He said they have been in discussion with Ken Short and they have offered up all of the remaining materials not being used to the Heritage Farm Museum. Mr. Reich said he has worked on similar projects where they have underpinned the foundation, similarly in mud. Mr. Reich said it was a shame to take the outbuildings apart and ruin the character of the barn and corn crib. Mr. Foster said they liked the building spaces and wanted to keep as much on the property as possible. Mr. Reich thought they were missing an opportunity as the buildings can be fixed and saving the historic character. He said they have done a good job at making all of the structures look compatible with what is there. He said fixing the buildings would be less expensive.

Ms. Flynn Giles had questions regarding the Standards for Rehabilitation. She said the spatial relationships are changing and she wanted to understand how all of that fits within the standards that are cited. Mr. Penza said they have structural issues with all of the buildings on site and there is no way to meet current Code and deal with insulation. He said it is a 30-acre property, maintains rural character and rural outbuildings within that site. Mr. Penza did not agree they were changing the character of the site.

Ms. Zoren agreed with the previous comments. She said for the house addition, she liked the newer versions rather than the original plan. She said the orientation is better and materials look nice. For the corn crib/pool house, she liked the plan but agreed it would be great to save the historic building, or to rebuild on the existing footprint and keep it at a similar size and scale. Ms. Zoren said it would be nice to use as many materials from the existing as they can. For the barn, she asked if you drive by the barn before getting to the main house. She said the staff report mentions a rare log granary but no details were provided. Mr. Foster said the granary is within the barn and is about a dozen logs, termite infested. He finds they are of no value other than being incredibly old. He does not think any can be reused, but he has offered them to Mr. Short for the Heritage Farm Museum. Mr. Foster said the barn is not weather controlled right now so the logs are not preserved. Ms. Zoren said her other concern was the size and scale of the new barn. She said the barn should become less noteworthy than the house. She said they are trying to mimic the shape of a barn, but a barn is typically very simplistic with just one major roof form and this design has a lot happening. She recommended simplifying the roof forms, the dormers, the porch roofs and that the more simple that it is will give that barn feel because the proposal does not. Ms. Zoren said the barn should feel like an outbuilding and not as detailed as the stone manor house. Mr. Foster said that just like the manor house additions where the new stone mimics the original manor; it is hard to distinguish the old from the new outbuilding deconstructions. They intend that the outbuilding reconstructions are staying true to form with board and batten.

Ms. Danna concurred with Ms. Zoren’s comments. She said it is wonderful they are taking huge pains to maintain the beauty of the house. She said the proposal of what the barn looks like and what it will look like are very different. She hopes they can use as many elements as possible in the new structures. She said the house addition looks good and blends in well.
Mr. Shad agreed with the other Commission comments in regards to the barn. He said they did a good job with house addition, and that it was separated enough to be distinguishable from the historic house.

**Motion:** There was no motion as the case was for Advisory Comments.

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

**OTHER BUSINESS**

1. **MHT and MDOT SHA consultation process** - Project No. SP122D4D the Patapsco Regional Greenway Project for the Elkridge to Guinness Connection.

The Commission reviewed the submitted material and concurred that there was no adverse effect on historic properties.

2. **Administrative Updates** – Staff to provide overview of updates needed to application forms.

Ms. Holmes explained that several application forms would be updated in the coming months to address the historic trees for advisory comments, as well as updated application instructions.

3. **Design Guideline Update** – General comments and feedback on the following chapters:
   a. Chapter 1: Introduction
   b. Chapter 2: History
   c. Chapter 4: The Role of the Federal Government
   d. Glossary

This item was not discussed.

4. **Reminder for June 2 HPC Meeting** - The Howard County Historic Preservation Commission will consider amendments to the Commission’s Rules of Procedure at its June 2, 2022 meeting. The Commission will consider amendments to update meeting procedures for demolition by neglect, update meeting procedures for hybrid meetings, and make technical corrections. Proposed amendments will be available on the Commission’s website 30 days before its June 2, 2022 meeting when they may be proposed for adoption. The meeting will be conducted as a virtual web meeting/conference call. Instructions for attending are on the Commission’s webpage.

https://www.howardcountymd.gov/boards-commissions/historic-preservation-commission

Staff reminded the Commission the vote for the proposed amendments to the Rules of Procedure would take place at the June meeting.
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