



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

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

www.howardcountymd.gov
410-313-2350
FAX 410-313-3467
TDD 410-313-2323

MAY MINUTES

The fifth regular meeting for the year 2009 of the Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, May 7, 2009 in the Tyson Room II located at 8930 Stanford Boulevard in Columbia, Maryland.

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

Member absent: Samuel Crozier

Staff present: Samantha Stoney, Mina Hilsenrath, Dan Bennett, Jim Vannoy and Virginia Vargo

Chairperson Lisa Badart opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m. and asked the Commission members if there were any changes to the April 15, 2009 minutes. Joseph Hauser made a motion to approve the minutes as written, and Lisa Badart seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

- 1) #09-14– 3407 Deanwood Avenue, Ellicott City
- 2) #09-19 – 4317 Maisel Farm Lane, Ellicott City, HO-238
- 3) #09-20 – 8060 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-98
- 4) #09-21 – 3570 Sylvan Lane, Ellicott City

#09-19 – 4317 Maisel Farm Lane, Ellicott City, HO-238

Tax credit pre-approval for repair of stone wall and chimney.

Applicant: Bao Luong

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT, the house dates to 1860. The house is listed on the Howard County Historic Sites Inventory as HO-238, Glenelg Manor Gardener's Cottage. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval to re-point the stone wall and brick chimney as needed. The Applicant will also repair or replace loose stone as needed.

Staff Comments: The mortar should be consistent in color and make-up of that on the existing house. Brick and stone should be replaced in-kind, to match the existing.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval.

Testimony: Chairperson Badart swore in the Applicant, Bao Luong. Mr. Luong explained that he has had the building examined by a contractor who recommended only re-pointing where it is needed.

Chairperson Badart swore in Anita Woodley, Mr. Luong's wife. Joe Hauser asked if the contractor had any recommendations on the makeup of the mortar. Ms. Woodley explained that the contractor, Mr. Cannetti, recommended that they use the same, or very similar, mortar being used at Doughoregan. The

stonemason who is re-pointing Doughoregan is bringing a sample for the Applicants so they can see the color. The stonemason feels the color and consistency will match the Applicant's house. If a local mortar match is not available, the second choice is to get the mortar prepared from Virginia Lime Works.

Motion: Joseph Hauser made a motion to approve the tax credit, and Eileen Tennor seconded. The vote was unanimous to approve.

#09-20 – 8060 Main Street, Ellicott City, HO-98

Extensive exterior repairs to building, site improvements, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: T. Garland and Suzanne Wilson

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT the building dates to 1900. The building is listed on the Howard County Historic Sites Inventory as HO-98, The Lauman House.

The Applicants propose extensive exterior repairs and site improvements, including:

- 1) Replacement of exterior clapboard German siding, corner boards, fascia, eaves, bracket boards, and trim on building as needed
- 2) Roof – 3-tab asphalt shingle, white to match existing
- 3) Gutters and downspouts – 6-inch gutters, prefinished color to match corners
- 4) Chimney – repair, add cap and paint
- 5) Painting siding – colors to be approved
- 6) Repairs and waterproofing to foundation
- 7) Remove existing shutters
- 8) Windows and doors – replace 15 windows with double-hung 6:6 aluminum clad simulated divided lites, replace center facade window with door (clad wood and glass) similar to original, replace one door with window to match new windows
- 9) Replacement of doors – black, metal clad similar to existing
- 10) Lighting – replace fixture on front of building
- 11) Reconstruction of concrete egress stairway with black aluminum railing on side of building
- 12) Replacement of wood stairs on side of building
- 13) Installation of wood privacy fence
- 14) Installation of new iron balcony and gate

The Applicants seek tax credit pre-approval for all work.

Staff Comments: The Application generally complies with Chapter 6 recommendations for rehabilitation. Due to the prominent location along Main Street, Staff recommends all doors and windows, visible from the street, be made of wood.

The site improvements will be a dramatic improvement. The installation of an iron gate and black aluminum railing along the side stairway is consistent with Chapter 9.D recommendations. The application is not consistent on the material to be used on the stairway railing – both iron and black aluminum are mentioned. This item requires further clarification.

New construction and site elements that do not affect the structural integrity of the building are not eligible for tax credits (such as railings and fences).

The color of siding choice #1 (pink) is out of character with the historic district; Staff recommends color choice #2 (purple).

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends:

- 1) Approval of work proposed in items 1-7 and 10-14.
- 2) Approval of aluminum clad windows and metal clad doors on the side and rear of the building, but Denial of those materials on the front of the building. Approval of wood windows and doors on the front of the building.
- 3) Denial of pink paint, Approval of purple.
- 4) Tax credit pre-approval for items 1 through 7 and for façade work restoring the look of the original building, including the second level center door (if wood is used for door) and balcony.
- 5) Tax credit pre-approval for replacement wood doors and windows, if used (only replacement of existing windows and doors are eligible, all new doors and windows are considered new construction).

Testimony: Chairperson Badart swore in the architect, Julie Junkin, of Furrow Avenue, Ellicott City. Ms. Junkin asked the Commission to consider approving the balcony and gate in powder coated aluminum instead of iron in order to save money. Mr. Hauser asked if salvaging railings and balcony materials from a salvage yard had been considered. Ms. Junkin pointed out that there are buildings on Main Street that have used aluminum railings. Ms. Junkin pointed out that the “O”, which is incorporated into the railing design, is part of the business name and signage. She said the owners are willing to do the railings and balcony in steel but would prefer aluminum. Mr. Hauser replied that the building is one of the showcase buildings on Main Street, and he finds an iron railing on the balcony and gate would be most appropriate. Ms. Tennor agreed.

The staff recommended wood windows on the front of the building and Ms. Junkin said they will use wood instead of the aluminum clad on the front and side. Ms. Junkin asked if the Commission would approve painting the windows black, as the original application was for black aluminum clad wood windows. The windows are now painted red. There is currently a side door with a small deck and stairs that will be replaced with a window. Ms. Junkin asked for confirmation that the replacement would not be eligible for tax credits. Ms. Junkin asked if the central door (which is replacing a window) on the façade would be eligible for tax credits. Samantha Stoney told Ms. Junkin that the central door would be eligible because the owners are restoring the building to its original look.

Ms. Badart asked about the color of the building. Ms. Junkin said the siding on the front of the building will be replaced, and on the sides and rear it will be replaced as needed. The entire building will be painted. Mr. Hauser asked what the finish of the paint will be and Ms. Junkin replied that it will be a flat finish. The shutters will be removed and the trim and gutters will be painted white, with purple siding, and black windows. The windows will be replaced with wood Jeld-Wen® simulated divided lite, 6:6, double-hung. Mr. Hauser asked for an explanation of simulated divided lite, and Ms. Junkin explained that the grille is on the outside and is not removable. The doors will be painted black.

Mr. Hauser asked how the balcony will be supported. Ms. Junkin said the balcony is for decorative purposes, although the doors will open. There will be no support brackets. The bottom of the balcony will have a plate on it that bolts into the structure. Mr. Hauser stated that the joist needs to run back into the structure. Ms. Junkin said the interior floors are now plywood and need to be removed, making it possible to secure the balcony into the building, to avoid using brackets under the balcony. Mr. Hauser stated that having brackets support the balcony would be obstructive to headroom on the street

underneath the balcony. Dan Bennett said the building code will require the balcony support 100 pounds per square inch if the doors are operable.

Mr. Hauser inquired about the rear privacy fence, and Ms. Junkin explained that the building will be a bed and breakfast or an inn, so the owners would like to provide privacy for the guests by installing a 6 foot privacy vertical wood board fence on the side of the stairs. An existing stairway will be turned 90 degrees in order to access the second level. There is a privacy fence in the rear which will remain and existing wrought iron rails which will not be removed.

Ms. Badart asked why black was chosen for the windows. Suzanne Wilson, co-owner, was sworn by Chairperson Badart. Ms. Wilson replied that black was chosen because historical research indicated at one time the windows were black.

Motion: Ms. Tennor made a motion to approve as follows:

Items 1-7 and 10-14 of the Applicant's proposal as recommended by Staff, and Items 8-9 as modified by the Commission.

- 1) Replacement of exterior clapboard German siding, corner boards, fascia, eaves, bracket boards, and trim on building as needed
- 2) Roof – 3-tab asphalt shingle, white to match existing
- 3) Gutters and downspouts – 6-inch gutters, prefinished color to match corners
- 4) Chimney – repair, add cap and paint
- 5) Painting siding – purple siding, white trim, black windows
- 6) Repairs and waterproofing to foundation
- 7) Remove existing shutters
- 8) Windows and doors to be replaced with wood (existing windows on the back will remain)
- 9) Doors to be replaced with wood, painted black
- 10) Lighting – to be black (as mentioned in application)
- 11) Reconstruction of concrete egress stairway with black aluminum railing on side of building
- 12) Replacement of wood stairs on side of building
- 13) Installation of wood privacy fence
- 14) Installation of new black iron balcony and gate

Ms. Badart seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous to approve.

#09-14 –3407 Deanwood Avenue, Ellicott City

Install pavers.

Applicant: John Russell and Denise Cortis

Background and Scope of Work: The house was built in 2005 and is not a contributing structure; it is located in the Woods of Park Place subdivision within the Ellicott City Historic District. Due to delays at the April meeting, the Applicants asked to defer their proposal until the May meeting and subsequently withdrew their request for a driveway expansion.

The Applicants propose to install an 18-inch wide border of decorative pavers around a parking pad that provides access to the entrance walkway. The proposed paved border will use 'Brownstone Red' Dublin pavers, resembling the brick foundation of the house.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6.B recommendations for non-historic buildings and Chapter 9.D recommendations for walkways.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval.

Testimony: Chairperson Badart swore in the Applicant, John Russell. Mr. Russell said the pavers will match the foundation of the house as closely as possible.

Motion: Mr. Hauser moved to approve and Ms. Tennor seconded. The vote was unanimous to approve.

#09-21 – 3570 Sylvan Lane, Ellicott City

Multi-story addition, rebuilding porch, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Charles Kyler

Background & Scope of Work: According to MDAT, the building dates to 1899. In 1999 the Applicant received approval to construct an addition, with a turret/bay feature and a porch extension. In 2000 the Applicant returned to the Commission with a request to construct the addition in phases, with the final product to look the same. The Commission cannot approve phasing, but indicated that construction may take place within the timeframe allowed by the Decision and Order. A portion of the addition was constructed in 2000, converting the original L-shaped house to a rectangle. The entire proposed addition was never constructed. The Applicant now is seeking approval to build an L-shaped addition.

The proposed addition will be a multi-story addition on the right side and rear of the house. The Applicant proposes to construct a turret feature on the right side of the house to mask the addition. The proposed addition will use HardiPlank® Siding - Colonial Smooth (color to match existing house), square cut HardieShingle® for the turret and fish scale HardieShingle® on all gables and as a band detail on the turret. The Applicant proposes to install aluminum clad Pella® windows. The staircase on the rear of the house will be reused on the rear of the proposed addition. The addition will have louvered wood green shutters.

Due to rot and termite damage the Applicant proposes to demolish and rebuild the porch, extending it around the right side of the house. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval. The porch will be rebuilt using wood and the flooring will be Ipe, unfinished wood. Roofing materials will match the existing structure and paint colors will remain the same.

Staff Comments: Page 24 of the Guidelines states “alterations should not make the building appear either older or newer than it is known to be by using details from another style or period.” Page 51 of the Guidelines states “additions should be subordinate to historic buildings and not compete with or obscure the existing structure.”

Additions should comply with the Guideline recommendations for new additions on pages 51 through 53:

- Design and fit additions to avoid damaging or obscuring key architectural features of a historic building.

- 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 ways.
- Design additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new. Additions may be contemporary in design or may reference motifs from the historic building, but should not directly imitate the historic building.
- Design an addition to be subordinate to the historic building in size, height, scale and detail to allow the form of the original structure to be seen.
- For any building, design the addition so that its proportions, the arrangement of windows and doors, and the relationship of solids to voids are compatible with the existing structure. Use a roof design that echoes or complements the original roof life.
- Design windows to be similar in size, proportion and arrangement to the existing windows.

The proposal does not comply with the Guidelines – the addition, combined with the previous (2000) addition appears to be as large as, if not larger than, the original house, and will be highly visible from the street. The turret feature is reflective of the Queen Anne style, which the house is not. As such, it is not an appropriate treatment and changes the character of the vernacular style of the house. Given the sightlines to the house from Sylvan Lane, the turret has the potential to be the dominant visual feature of the house. The scale of the addition and turret are difficult to understand without dimensioned site plans and architectural elevations for the proposed construction. Typically an application for an addition is considered incomplete without architectural plans and elevations. However, given staff concerns about the addition’s compliance with the Guidelines, further direction from the Commission is needed before asking for such plans.

When the addition was built in 2000, 1:1 windows were installed, which do not match the historic 2:2 pattern. Staff recommends new windows match the historic 2:2 pattern. Also, a photo submitted with the 2000 addition shows that the windows were placed on the left side of the addition, while the historic windows are centered. Staff recommends any new windows be centered to complement the historic house.

The reconstruction of the porch, if built to match the existing, would be eligible for tax credits. However, the Applicant proposes to extend the porch around to the proposed addition, changing the character of the façade. Page 34 of the Guidelines recommend: “If a porch must be replaced, the replacement porch, even if simplified in detail, should reflect the size and visual weight of the original.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends:

- 1) Denial of the addition as submitted.
- 2) Tax credit pre-approval for portion of porch that is reconstructed to match the original.
- 3) Denial of tax credit pre-approval for porch extension.

Testimony: Chairperson Badart swore in the Applicant, Charles Kyler. Mr. Kyler stated that he was unaware that staff did not have a copy of the blueprints submitted in 1999, and submitted a new copy. Mr. Kyler explained that the windows on the addition do match the existing house (as mentioned in the staff report), but he had temporarily taken the dividers off while working on the exterior of the home. He presented photographs of the house showing a view from Sylvan Lane. The proposed addition is set back 10 feet from the front of the house and the roofline is 1 foot shorter than the original structure. From the prospective of the roadway about 35-40 feet below the grade of the house, the turret would appear to be much lower. Mr. Kyler explained the idea was to make the proposed addition slightly

smaller and set it back to diminish the effect of the addition on the house. Mr. Kyler also requested to extend the porch to come to the edge of the proposed addition, hiding the lower half of the turret beneath the porch. Mr. Kyler explained that through research, he has determined the house is a Folk Victorian or a Country Victorian, built in the late 1800s and early 1900s. He thinks the porch brackets and interior elements of the house lean towards the Queen Anne style.

Ms. Badart asked why Mr. Kyler wants to expand the porch to a wraparound, and he replied it is to help mask the addition and as a place to entertain. Mr. Kyler referenced several houses on Church Road with wraparound porches. Ms. Badart finds the wraparound porch adds to the bulk of the addition. Mr. Hauser thought the porch should not wrap around and the original porch should stand by itself. Ms. Badart said extending the porch disturbs the symmetry of the original house. The proposed porch addition will be wider than the historic front porch. Mr. Kyler suggested stepping the porch addition back, in order to clearly delineate between the original and new porch. While several Commission members initially liked this idea, they were unable to visualize what the porch roof would actually look like. Mr. Hauser explained the difficulty associated with stepping the porch back and turning the roof appropriately. Mr. Kyler attempted to sketch on the plans to reflect the new idea about stepping the porch back, but this was not able to be adequately resolved by him or the Commission members.

Mr. Kyler explained that he proposes to add shingles to the turret to distinguish the new structure from the old and switch to the HardiPlank® siding around the side of the building so there is a visual break from the front of the house. He explained the house is built on a ridge which does not allow much room for expansion on the rear, therefore a major portion of the addition is on the side of the house. Ms. Badart asked what the square footage of the original house was, and Mr. Kyler replied approximately 1,260 square feet. The original house was “L” shaped and was 30 feet deep and 32 feet across the front. Mr. Kyler explained the rear addition that fills in the “L” shape was built in 1999 after HDC approval was received.

Ms. Tennor explained to the Applicant that the Commission was having difficulty accepting the turret, because it would significantly alter the character of the house, which is simple and symmetrical. Mr. Kyler indicated that he submitted photos of other homes in the historic district with turrets. Ms. Badart explained that the proportions of those houses are different and not comparable. Mr. Hauser agreed, explaining some the example houses are bigger and the turrets were historically incorporated elements. Mr. Kyler explained the turret was set back in order to avoid disturbing the historic house and original windows. Mr. Kyler explained that he worked with his architect to find the best design for an addition to minimize the disturbance to the original house. He picked the turret design because it is from the same time period of the house.

Ms. Badart raised the question about whether a rectangular addition would be less overwhelming. Mr. Kyler brought an alternative design on his laptop that portrayed a rectangular addition. Mr. Kyler showed the Commission several different views of the rectangular addition. Ms. Badart said the rectangular addition looked more compatible with the house. The Applicant described the addition as having bay windows, which are not allowed by the Guidelines. Staff noted that the bay depicted by the Applicant is not a bay window in the typical sense, but rather a projecting bay wall, which the Guidelines have no objection to.

The Commission members agreed they would be unable to reach a decision without seeing revised drawings for the addition and the porch.

Motion: Ms. Badart made a motion to continue the application until the June 4, 2009 meeting. Ms. Tennor seconded. The vote was unanimous to continue.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

Mina Hilsenrath spoke to Commission members regarding the following Discussion Items:

- 1) *Proposed revisions to the Historic District Commission Code for advisory comments on subdivision and site development plans and submission deadlines.*

The County currently has a 15-day deadline for application submissions to the HDC. Staff would like to have the deadline changed to 22-days, which keeps the deadline on a Wednesday as it currently is, but allows staff more adequate time to review applications. Most Applicants submit on the day of the deadline, which only allows Staff one week to submit the legal ad, go on site visits, write staff reports and post the Agenda on the web site. The extra week will allow Staff time to thoroughly check the plans and contact the Applicant if there are questions regarding the Application.

Mr. Hauser stated he feels that properties adjacent to the Historic District should be reviewed by the Commission. As a resident of Ellicott City, he received a letter informing him that the Court Hill Apartment complex is planning a development which only borders on historic properties. The property was let out of the Historic District in 1972, and even though the property is adjacent to historic properties, it does not have to come before the HDC for advisory comments.

Ms. Hilsenrath said that Mr. Hauser's concerns were shared with people within County government, but that it would be a substantial change to the power and authority of the Commission. All development plans that are submitted come before Ms. Stoney for review and she can comment to the Subdivision Review Committee if the Historic District is affected.

- 2) *Proposed guidelines for solar panels and devices*

Ms. Stoney explained that she tried to make the proposed guidelines for solar panels correlate with all relevant recommendations in the design guidelines so that nothing of historic value would be disturbed. Ms. Stoney researched other various places to find examples of guidelines allowing solar panels in historic districts.

The technology for solar panels has evolved and there are new options that look like asphalt shingles, which have a low profile. Similar to any change, not all applications will be approved if the proposal would negatively affect the historic structure. Ms. Stoney asked Commission members to review the materials and make notations for future discussion.

- 3) *Ellicott City Parking Study*

Ms. Hilsenrath explained that Desmond Associates has been hired by the Revenue Authority to conduct a parking study of Ellicott City. Desmond Associates inventoried the parking spaces downtown and examined how spaces turn over. There currently is an adequate supply of parking in downtown Ellicott City, but shortages of space occur at peak times during the week

and at various times on the weekends. The deficits are not so great that a parking structure is needed at this time. The main area of deficit seems to be in the small lot behind the Ellicott City Brewing Company and at nearby on-street spaces. The other area of concern is on-street parking at the lower end of Main Street. On-street parking that turns over regularly is a key to thriving businesses. There is a perceived deficit of on-street parking, which is due to residents and employees moving their cars from space to space during the daytime hours because of the two-hour parking limit.

Recommended strategies are:

- Improve enforcement of on street parking. There should be a two-hour limit for the downtown zone so that after two hours you cannot move to another space; you must go to an off-street parking lot.
- Enforce the use of handicapped spaces. There may be abuse of the handicapped plates or use of an MVA tag by someone who does not warrant use of the space. Delegation of that power can be given to the company that does the enforcement.
- Institute a fee hierarchy based on parking lot locations. On-street parking would be the most expensive and the lots less expensive to encourage turn-over on-street. Parking meters could be re-used or multi-space meters could be introduced.
- Future consideration of a parking garage. There are various locations that have been studied for the construction of a parking garage, including behind the Post Office, the Ellicott City Brewing Company, and the Roger Carter Center. This may come at some time in the future if the economy improves and revenue can be allocated (5 to 10 years).

The study will soon be finalized and posted on the web site.

Dan Bennett stated there has always been opposition to building anything on the lot by the Roger Carter Center because it would interfere with the view of the Heine House. When asked why the lot on the Baltimore County side was not considered for a parking garage Ms. Hilsenrath noted that the consultant was concerned about the safety factors involved with crossing the bridge and Howard County does not own the land. Parking downtown is currently supported primarily by citations because there are so few meters and very little funds generated through parking fees.

The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

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

Elmina J. Hilsenrath, ASLA
Executive Secretary

Lisa Badart, Chairperson

Virginia L. Vargo, Recording Secretary

T:\DPZ\Shared\RCD\HDC\Minutes\2009\May_minutes.docx