



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

Administered by the Department of Planning and Zoning

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

September Minutes

Thursday, September 5, 2019; 7:00 p.m.

The August meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission was held on Thursday, September 5, 2019 in the C. Vernon Gray room located at 3430 Court House Drive, Ellicott City, MD 21043. Mr. Roth moved to approve the August minutes. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

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

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

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

Consent Agenda

1. MA-19-21c – 8202 Main Street, Ellicott City
2. MA-19-02c – 6165 Old Washington Road, Elkridge, HO-804

Regular Agenda

3. HPC-19-43 – 8044-8048 Main Street, Ellicott City
4. HPC-19-44 – 8060 Main Street, Ellicott City
5. HPC-19-45 – 8090-8092 Main Street, Ellicott City
6. HPC-19-46 – 8090-8092 Main Street, Ellicott City
7. HPC-19-47 – 3534 Church Road, Ellicott City

CONSENT AGENDA

MA-19-21c – 8202 Main Street, Ellicott City

Final tax credit 20.112 approval.

Applicant: Ron Peters

Request: The applicant, Ron Peters, requests final tax credit approval for work that was pre-approved in case MA-19-21 for 8202 Main Street, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1850. The applicant was pre-approved through the Minor Alterations/Executive Secretary process in May 2019 to replace the walkway to fix the water penetration into the building.

Scope of Work: The applicant seeks final tax credit approval. The applicant submitted documentation that \$1,500.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work and seeks \$375.00 in final tax credits. The work complies with that pre-approved and the cancelled checks and other documentation total the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted, for \$375.00 in final tax credits.

Testimony: Mr. Shad asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to add or correct the case or if there was anyone who wished to testify in opposition of the case. There was no one in the audience who wanted to testify.

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

MA-19-02c – 6165 Old Washington Road, Elkridge

Final tax credit 20.112 approval.

Applicant: Andrea Hermann

Request: The applicant, Andrea Hermann, requests final tax credit approval for work that was pre-approved in case MA-19-02 for 6165 Old Washington Road, Elkridge.

Background and Site Description: This property is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-804, the George Hobbs House and Store. According to the Inventory form, the house dates approximately to 1850. The applicant was pre-approved through the Executive Secretary process in January 2019 to replace roof, gutters and associated work.

Scope of Work: The applicant seeks final tax credit approval. The applicant submitted documentation that \$25,080.00 was spent on eligible, pre-approved work and seeks \$6,270.00 in final tax credits. The work complies with that pre-approved and the cancelled checks and other documentation total the requested amount.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted, for \$6,270.00 in final tax credits.

Testimony: Mr. Shad asked if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to add or correct the case or if there was anyone who wished to testify in opposition of the case. There was no one in the audience who wanted to testify.

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

REGULAR AGENDA

HPC-19-43 – 8044-8048 Main Street, Ellicott City

Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations.

Applicant: Howard County Department of Public Works

Request: The applicant, Howard County Department of Public Works, requests a Certificate of Approval to make exterior alterations and repairs at 8044-8048 Main Street, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building at 8044-8048 Main Street dates to 1771.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to make the following exterior alterations as this property will be an EC Safe and Sound Access point. The proposed gate alterations will permit the gate to be remotely released during an active flood emergency event. The alterations include:

- 1) Install electronic access control hardware on the existing gate and on the wall behind the gate. On the outside of the gate will be a keypad with a black finish. Once behind the gate, there will be a covered gate release button installed to permit access out of the gate. Below this button will be a high water sensor, designed to release the gate at high water.
- 2) Install control boxes on the brick wall of the building inside the alleyway (set back a few feet from Main Street) and two corresponding conduits to power hardware. Two control boxes are currently needed on the exterior of the building. Each one is approximately 14-inches square. Options are being considered to reduce the size/condense into one box. All conduits will be painted to closely match the wall color to greatest extent possible.
- 3) Repair the existing gate. The latch is damaged and needs to be repaired or replaced. The hinges will be refurbished. The existing key cylinder will be removed and a blank plate (painted black to match the gate) will be installed.
- 4) Install round steel handrail along staircase, to be painted black. Handrail will be installed in mortar joints where feasible.
- 5) Install a 12"x12" yellow and black Safe and Sound "high ground" sign on gate.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 6.M: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings, Equipment and Hardware

- 1) *Chapter 6.M states, "Where it is not possible to hide equipment, it should be designed to blend as much as possible with the structure and should not obscure or damage important historic details."*
- 2) *Chapter 6.M recommends, "Whenever possible, install equipment out of sign of public ways or other properties."*
- 3) *Chapter 6.M states the following is Routine Maintenance, "installing or altering door or window locks, doorknobs, mail slots, individual mailboxes or other minor hardware."*

The installation of Items 1 and 2 (electronic access control hardware on the gate and the control boxes and conduit) and the repair and slight modification of Item 3 (repair gate, replace key cylinder with blank plate) above comply with the Guideline recommendations. The hardware and control boxes will be installed on the side walls of the building, within the alley and will be set back a few feet from Main Street. The conduit will be painted to match the building façade to the greatest extent possible, to blend with the structure. The location on the side of the building, within the alley, is not highly visible and the installation of the equipment in this location will not obscure or damage important historic details. Since the Routine Maintenance Guideline is somewhat vague, the Commission should consider which hardware items can be considered routine maintenance and which will require a certificate of approval.

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

- 1) Chapter 9.D explains, "There are many examples of simple, modern, dark metal railings, which blend unobtrusively with Ellicott City's historic structures."
- 2) Chapter 9.D recommends, "Install open fencing, generally not more than five feet high, of wood or dark metal."

There are no explicit recommendations for railing along staircases in the Guidelines, although railings are mentioned as shown above in Item 1. The guidelines for fences apply to railings as well. The proposed steel railing, to be painted black, complies with the Guideline recommendation as it will be a simple design using dark metal. The proposed railing will blend unobtrusively into the side of the building along the alley staircase.

Chapter 11: Signs

- 1) Chapter 11 recommends:
 - a. "Use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three."
 - b. "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."
 - c. "Use directorial and informational signs conservatively, in locations that will maximize their effectiveness. Limit the number of freestanding poles to minimize streetscape clutter."
 - d. "Design signs of a particular type with a consistent style, lettering, size, color and logo."

The proposed EC Safe and Sound High Ground sign complies with the Guideline recommendations. The sign will only be 1 square foot and will consist of two colors, significantly less than what is recommended as a maximum. The High Ground sign system has already been approved in other locations along Main Street, and this sign is designed in the same style of the previous signs. All EC Safe and Sound signs for High Ground use one 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 the applicant Robert Z. Hollenbeck from the Department of Public Works. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Hollenbeck had any comments to add to the staff report. Mr. Hollenbeck gave background on the Ellicott City Safe and Sound project and explained the need to create additional egress points in the event of a flood. Mr. Hollenbeck explained that the County partnered with willing property owners to create the access points and explained how the gates will be unlocked during a flood watch and also have water sensors that would trip the gates if water levels rose unexpectedly.

Mr. Hollenbeck explained that DPW created a mockup gate release and sensor between the Caplan and Johnsons buildings with all the proposed equipment and had the equipment tested by the Fire Marshall,

Police Department, DILP, the County Executives Office and building owners that were going to incorporate this system onto their gates.

Ms. Tennor asked how high the water levels would be when the water sensor is tripped. Mr. Hollenbeck explained that DPW tested installing the mockup sensor one to two inches higher than the sidewalk and explained at that point the water would be above the curb. Ms. Tennor asked how big the sensor will be. Mr. Hollenbeck said the box the sensor is located in is roughly 3" x 4". He said the sensor box has a hole at the bottom and as water fills the box, it trips the sensor inside of the box.

Mr. Hollenbeck said the gate was damaged at the proposed location for the sensor installation and DPW worked with the owner to have the gate taken to a welder, repaired and rehung. Mr. Hollenbeck said DILP requested a handrail be hung on one side of the staircase for safety purposes. Ms. Holmes asked if the handrail would be metal. Mr. Hollenbeck confirmed it would be a metal handrail. Ms. Tennor asked if the handrail would be painted black. Mr. Hollenbeck said the handrail would be painted black.

Ms. Zoren asked what color the control boxes would be painted. Mr. Hollenbeck said DPW would try to paint the control boxes to match the color of the brick on the building, and that for each location installed DPW would try to match the exterior wall color.

The Commission discussed with Mr. Hollenbeck if there was a backup fail safe if the gate did not trip. Mr. Hollenbeck explained that in the event of a flood watch the gate is supposed to be unlocked and if the water rose there is the water sensor to unlock the gate. Mr. Hollenbeck explained that there is also a key pad on the gate and if someone was standing at the locked gate, the person could call Emergency Services and EMS would be able to give the caller the key pad number to punch into the key pad to unlock the gate.

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

HPC-19-44 – 8060 Main Street, Ellicott City

Certificate of Approval for exterior alterations.

Applicant: Howard County Department of Public Works

Request: The applicant, Howard County Department of Public Works, requests a Certificate of Approval to make exterior alterations and repairs at 8060 Main Street, Ellicott City.

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

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to make the following exterior alterations as this property will be an EC Safe and Sound Access point. The proposed gate alterations will permit the gates to be remotely released during an active flood emergency event. The alterations include:

- 1) Install electronic access control hardware on the existing gate fronting the sidewalk (existing gate #1) and on the fence behind the gate. On the outside of the gate will be a keypad with a black finish. Once behind the gate, there will be a covered gate release button installed to permit access out of the gate. The gate controller conduit will run on the back side of the fence and be painted black. The high water sensor will be installed inside the gate post. The concrete sidewalk will be cut and patched as required to run the conduit to the latch side of the gate.

- 2) Conduit will run from the front gate (existing gate #1) along the side of the building next to the existing cables. The conduit will be placed behind the downspout where possible. Conduit will be painted to match color of mortar where on stone, and will be anchored to mortar only, not stone.
- 3) Install electronic gate hardware on existing gate #2, a wooden gate at the rear/side of the property. Install control boxes on the rear of the building in the existing service area. Two control boxes are currently needed on the exterior of the building. Each one is approximately 14-inches square. Options are being considered to reduce the size/condense into one box. Exposed conduit will be painted to match the building.
- 4) Install a 12"x12" yellow and black Safe and Sound "high ground" sign on the black gate facing the sidewalk (existing gate #1).

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 6.M: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings, Equipment and Hardware

- 1) Chapter 6.M states, "Where it is not possible to hide equipment, it should be designed to blend as much as possible with the structure and should not obscure or damage important historic details."
- 2) Chapter 6.M recommends, "Whenever possible, install equipment out of sign of public ways or other properties."
- 3) Chapter 6.M states the following is Routine Maintenance, "installing or altering door or window locks, doorknobs, mail slots, individual mailboxes or other minor hardware."

The installation of Items 1 – 3 (electronic access control hardware on the gates and the control boxes and conduit) above comply with the Guideline recommendations. The control boxes will be installed on the rear of the building, and will not be visible from Main Street. The conduit will be painted to match the building façade to the greatest extent possible, to blend with the structure. The installation of the conduit along the side of the building and the installation of the equipment on the rear of the building will not obscure or damage important historic details. Since the Routine Maintenance Guideline is somewhat vague, the Commission should consider which hardware items can be considered routine maintenance and which will require a certificate of approval.

Chapter 11: Signs

- 1) Chapter 11 recommends:
 - a. "Use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three."
 - b. "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."
 - c. "Use directorial and informational signs conservatively, in locations that will maximize their effectiveness. Limit the number of freestanding poles to minimize streetscape clutter."
 - d. "Design signs of a particular type with a consistent style, lettering, size, color and logo."

The proposed EC Safe and Sound High Ground sign complies with the Guideline recommendations. The sign will only be 1 square foot and will consist of two colors, significantly less than what is recommended as a maximum. The High Ground sign system has already been approved in other locations along Main Street, and this sign is designed in the same style of the previous signs. All EC Safe and Sound signs for High Ground use one consistent style, lettering, size, color and logo.

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

Testimony: Mr. Hollenbeck was already sworn in. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Hollenbeck had any comments to add to the staff report. Mr. Hollenbeck clarified there were two gates at this proposed location. Ms. Burgess asked the Commission if the Commission would allow similar future applications for updated gates and water sensors to go through the Minor Alterations process. Mr. Shad confirmed the Commission would allow similar applications to be processed through Minor Alterations.

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

HPC-19-45 – 8090-8092 Main Street, Ellicott City

Certificate of Approval to construct deck.

Applicant: Donald R. Reuwer Jr.

Request: The applicant, Donald R. Reuwer Jr., requests a Certificate of Approval to construct a deck on the rear of the building at 8090-8092 Main Street, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1890. The existing rear deck and materials were approved in 2009 in case HDC-09-27.

This application was originally posted online as a Minor Alteration (MA-19-30) but was removed due to an objection.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to build a decked walkway and new deck off of the existing rear deck in order to comply with a Department of Inspections, Licenses and Permits requirement to have an “area of refuge” in the event of fire or flood. The application explains that the law requires the “area of refuge” to be 50 feet from the building. The proposed walkway and deck will be located in the rear of the property and will not be visible from Main Street. The new walkway and deck will match the existing in design, material and color, and will have gray composite decking and white PVC railings. The walkway will be four feet wide and the deck (area of refuge) will be 20 feet by 20 feet.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Chapter 7.B: New Construction: Additions, Porches and Outbuildings; Construction of New Porches and Decks

1) Chapter 7.B recommends:

- a. “Design new porches and decks to be simple, compatible in design with the existing building, and in scale with the existing building in size and roof height.”*
- b. “Decks should not be added to a historic building’s primary façade, or a façade highly visible from a public way. They should be substantial in appearance, having more of the character of a porch (avoid decks that appear to stand on “toothpicks”), and should be related in detail as much as possible to the style and character of the building.”*

The proposed walkway and deck will use the same materials and colors as those approved in 2009, which will make it compatible with the existing building in character and design. The proposed walkway and deck will be open-air and not enclosed with a roof, and as such, will be in scale with the existing building.

The deck will be added to the rear of the building and will not be visible from Main Street.

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

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in John Aguilera, the tenant of the building. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Aguilera had any comments to add to the staff report. Mr. Aguilera explained in order to comply with DILP regulations to have a distillery in the building, an area of refuge needed to be added. He explained that the deck would allow patrons to be up and away from flood or fire. He said the proposed deck could also be accessed from Church Road in the event of an emergency.

Mr. Reich said the deck could not be seen from Main Street. Mr. Aguilera agreed the deck would not be visible from Main Street. Ms. Tennor asked how the area of refuge would be utilized when the deck was not being used for its intended purpose. Ms. Tennor asked if patrons could use the deck to socialize, if there were occupancy restrictions and how would the applicant ensure that there would be room on this refuge or if it could potentially be used up. Mr. Aguilera said the occupancy use of the building was 70 people, which would amount to five square feet per person.

Mr. Roth asked if the deck would be used in the day to day business practices. Mr. Aguilera said the deck would not be used in the day to day, but would be used occasionally, and the business got the okay from DILP to allow patrons to have access to the deck outside of its intended purpose. Ms. Tennor asked if Mr. Aguilera was intending to put out tables and umbrellas on the deck. Mr. Aguilera said the business would not be putting furniture on the deck.

Ms. Tennor said that the deck would be visible to the neighbors. Mr. Aguilera said it would be visible to the neighbors, but it would not be visible from Church Road or Main Street. He said there is foliage in the neighbor's yard that will help block the view of the deck.

Mr. Reich asked if the deck/area of refuge would be located off the second floor of the building. Mr. Aguilera said the deck would be located off the second floor.

Ms. Tennor said the approval of the application would set a precedent on Main Street. Ms. Holmes explained that the area of refuge was required because of the type of business, which was considered an assembly use and noted that mercantile uses would not be subject to this kind of requirement. Mr. Roth said that there is nothing in the Guidelines that would prevent this particular location from adding a deck, regardless of the use.

Ms. Zoren clarified that an area of refuge would not include furniture as it would take up the required square foot space. Mr. Taylor asked Mr. Aguilera if tables, chairs or umbrellas would be added to the deck. Mr. Aguilera said there would be no furniture on the deck because the occupancy of the building is 70 people and if they wanted to have 70 people and furniture on the deck, the deck would need to be larger.

Ms. Zoren asked if there were setbacks on the property for the deck. Ms. Holmes said there were no setbacks for this location but said if there were setbacks, Zoning and DILP would flag it during their review of the applicants plans and then the applicants would need to return to the HPC.

Mr. Shad asked if there was anyone in the audience that would like to make comments or statements on the application. There was no one in the audience that wished to speak.

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

HPC-19-46 – 8090-8092 Main Street, Ellicott City

Certificate of Approval to install signs.
Applicant: John Aguilera

Request: The applicant, John Aguilera, requests a Certificate of Approval to install signs on the front of the building at 8090-8092 Main Street, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1890.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to install five signs on the front façade of the building:

- 1) Sign #1 will be a projecting sign that will hang from a black steel bracket on the front left of the building above the door. The sign will be made of wood, stained black with white lettering. The sign will be 36 inches high by 32 inches wide. Due to the tapered sides, it should be less than 8 square feet. Sign #1 will read on 5 lines, with the 5th line on a separate board from the main sign:

Handcrafted
Ellicott
Distilling Co.
Distillery and Tavern
Charcuterie and Spirits (will hang on a separate board from the main sign)

- 2) Sign #2 will be a white vinyl window sign and will be located in the middle of the front three windows. The text will be 13.75 inches high by 34 inches wide for a total area of 2.86 square feet. The sign will read on two lines:

Ellicott
Distilling Co.

- 3) Sign #3 will be a white vinyl window sign that will be mounted on the bottom of the left side window on the three front windows. The text will be 16 inches high by 30 inches wide, for a total area of 3.33 square feet. The sign will read on four lines:

Serving...
Small Batch
Distilled
Spirits

- 4) Sign #4 will be a white vinyl window sign that will be mounted on the bottom of the right side window on the front three windows. The text will be 19.5 inches high by 30 inches wide, for a total area of 4 square feet. The sign will read on four lines:

Serving...
Gourmet
Charcuterie
& Fine Foods

- 5) Signs #5 will be a white vinyl window sign that will be mounted on the bottom of the center window on the three front windows. The text will be 17.5 inches high by 30 inches wide for a total area of 3.64 square feet. The sign will read on three lines:

Enjoy our...
Craft Cocktails
&
Tasting Room

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.”*
- c. *“use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three. Coordinate sign colors with the colors used in the building façade.”*
- d. *Emphasize the identification of the establishment rather than an advertising message on the face of the sign.*

Sign #1, the projecting sign, complies with recommendations A-D above, as the sign will contain the name of the business and a brief description of the business, and will consist of two colors, black and white.

Sign #2, the white vinyl business name sign to be located in the middle window, also complies with the recommendations as it will only contain the business name and be limited to one color.

Signs #3, 4, and 5 do not comply with the Guidelines and would be considered an advertising message. They do not contain the business name and repeat and elaborate on information that was more succinctly contained within the projecting sign.

2) *Chapter 11.A recommends:*

- a. *“use historically appropriate material such as wood or iron for signs and supporting hardware.”*
- b. *Use indirect lighting or concealed light fixtures with concealed wiring to illuminate signs. If the light source will be visible, select a fixture compatible with the style of the building. Minimize glare by focusing the light on the sign.*

Sign #1 will be a wood sign, hung from a metal bracket, which complies with this recommendation. The spec sheet for the bracket shows attached lighting, which is not referenced in the application and confirmation of the proposed style of bracket is needed. If the lighting is part of the bracket, as shown, additional information on how the lighting will be wired is needed.

Signs #2-5 will be vinyl window signs, a modern alternative to a painted window sign, and are historically appropriate.

Chapter 11.B: Signs, Commercial Buildings

- 3) *Chapter 11.B explains, "most buildings should not have more signs than uses or occupants. In a few cases a location may call for two signs for a business. When the two signs are on the same building façade, the best combination will often be one flat-mounted or window sign and one projecting sign. Multiple signs need to be coordinated so that the cumulative effect does not clutter or obscure the building façade."*
- 4) *Chapter 11.B recommends, "if more than one sign is used to identify a building's tenants, use signs that are similar in scale, harmonious in style and color, and located symmetrically or uniformly on the building."*
- 5) *Chapter 11.B recommends against, "two signs where one is sufficient to provide an easily visible identification of the business."*
- 6) *Chapter 11.B recommends against, "more than two signs per business per façade."*

The proposal to add 5 signs to the front façade of the building does not comply with the Guidelines. Sign #1, the projecting sign, best complies with the Guidelines. Sign #2, the white vinyl sign that is limited to the business name, also complies closely with the Guidelines because it identifies the building's tenant and complies with the Guideline recommendations for using more than one sign on a building.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC approve Sign #1, the projecting sign. If the Commission determines two signs to be appropriate for this building, Staff recommends the HPC approve Sign #2, the white vinyl business name sign.

Testimony: Mr. Aguilera was already sworn in. Mr. Shad asked if Mr. Aguilera had any comments to add to the staff report. Mr. Aguilera gave background on the creation of the business and said the distillery was slated to open in a month. Mr. Aguilera discussed the importance of the sign locations for visibility, the projecting sign giving pedestrian and vehicular circulation and the main vinyl sign for those standing directly in front of the building. He said the smaller signs are to advertise the business having a small cocktail room and food. Mr. Aguilera has found while trying to source materials that not everyone is aware of what a distillery is. He said that having the small descriptive signs will help people understand what the business has to offer. Mr. Aguilera said all food and spirits will be locally sourced and made.

Ms. Zoren asked if the smaller signs will have a background or if the signs will be only letters. Mr. Aguilera said the smaller vinyl signs will be letters only.

Mr. Reich said the projecting sign is straight forward, but he was not sure of the other three smaller vinyl signs. Mr. Reich noted that per the Guidelines, the Commission will approve one sign for a building unless it is a larger building and then the Commission will sometimes approve two. The Commission discussed previous applications with requests for multiple signs and explained that per the Guidelines, more than two signs have not been approved. Ms. Holmes referenced the staff report that noted Chapter 11.A of the Guidelines recommends against advertising messages. Ms. Tennor said she appreciated the applicants need for patronage, but in addition to possibly having a sign with store hours and an open and closed sign, the three smaller vinyl signs seemed to be too much for the façade.

Ms. Zoren said suggested increasing the size of the word "Distillery" on the sign, explaining that the large "Ellicott" does not stand out since the business is located within Ellicott City. Ms. Tennor agreed with Ms. Zoren.

Ms. Zoren asked if the bracket shown in Figure 8 of the staff report was already installed. Mr. Aguilera said that the bracket was not installed. Ms. Zoren said she felt the bracket proposed was too ornate to match with the character of the buildings. Mr. Reich asked how the sign will be lit. Mr. Aguilera said that

if the Commission decided the bracket was not appropriate he could get a straight bar bracket. Mr. Aguilera said for the lighting he could have a concealed light fixture on the bracket, or he could use an internally lit sign. Mr. Aguilera said he prefers the concealed light fixture, which would be wired through the bracket so that the wiring would not be visible.

Mr. Aguilera said that the application submitted specified that the vinyl lettering will be white, but said it will actually be a metallic silver to match the labels on the bottles produced by the business.

The Commission discussed both lighting choices and Ms. Holmes pointed out that the internally lit sign does not comply with the Guidelines. The Commission then discussed concealed and indirect lighting. Ms. Tennor asked about address numerals above the door on the transom shown in Figure 8 of the staff report and if Mr. Aguilera would change them over to match with the vinyl sign. Mr. Aguilera clarified that the numbers shown in the picture are from a Google image taken previously and the numbers are currently not there, he said they could put vinyl numbers in to match. Mr. Shad asked if there was anyone in the audience that wanted to speak to the case. There was no one in the audience that wished to speak.

Motion: Ms. Tennor moved to approve:

- 1) Sign number one, with the bracket that was submitted, or use a different bracket that can be submitted to Staff for review and approval based on the comments from the Commission.
 - a. With the lightning as shown in application.
 - b. A wood sign, so it has dimension, and it will be two panels.
- 2) Sign number two is the one shown in the center panel of the front window, that says "Ellicott Distilling Company"
 - a. That size relationship can be used or the applicant may modify the word "Distilling Company" slightly to make it larger relative to the word "Ellicott".
 - b. That sign would be in vinyl applied to the inside of the glass.
- 3) The other descriptors (the three vinyl advertising signs proposed to be located at the bottom of the windows) are not approved.

Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

HPC-19-47 – 3534 Church Road, Ellicott City

Certificate of Approval to demolish existing house and construct new house.

Applicant: Heather and Larry Gaetano

Request: The applicants, Heather and Larry Gaetano, request a Certificate of Approval to demolish the existing house and construct a new house on the same foundation at 3534 Church Road, Ellicott City.

Background and Site Description: This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT the building dates to 1936. The site contains one principal dwelling, an outbuilding and many mature specimen trees, many of which are located around the house. The principal dwelling has been vacant since 1985. The property consists of 4.91 acres and is zoned R-ED; Residential: Environmental Development. The property is also located within the Tiber Hudson Watershed and is currently subject to the 2018 Council Bill 56, which temporarily prohibits the issuance of certain permits and certain approvals of development plans and zoning changes for property that drains in whole, or in part, to the Tiber Branch Watershed.

This house is not listed on the Historic Sites Inventory, but the County Architectural Historian is in the process of working on an Inventory form and has provided the following architectural and historical information:

The house at 3534 Church Road sits on part of the Linwood property, which was subdivided in 1888 by the Merrick family. Lot 8, comprising 10 acres, was not sold by the Merricks until 1912, and was purchased by the Heine family for \$1,000. William and Agnes Heine were living in Virginia when they sold the land, presumably to their daughter, Katherine Fort Heine, in 1936. The log house was reportedly built at that time. There were two phases of log construction in the United States, an historical phase that was well-represented in Howard County from the eighteenth century to around the time of the Civil War, and a revival phase that began in the late nineteenth century and continues to this day. The Heine house is part of the revival phase, and retains much of its historic integrity for that period. The earliest log revival buildings were often resort architecture with an intentional rustic feel and a vague historicist impression, and these log homes were often influenced by that and intended to be vacation cabins. The Heine house certainly reads that way, with the logs exposed on both the exterior and interior, and the rafters and roof sheathing exposed in most of the ceilings. The board doors with wooden door knobs, latches, and iron strap hinges contribute to the rustic feel of the building, as does the commanding rubble stone fireplace and chimney stack. And the casement windows with small panes of glass harken back to the earliest period of American settlement on the east coast. In this case, the Heine house was also part of another building tradition in the U. S., the prefabricated kit house. This trend began in the early twentieth century, most notably by Sears, Roebuck and Company, who employed it as a way to sell their building materials. Other companies arose that only specialized in houses, and the Heine house is apparently part of that tradition, as well. While the house has had some termite damage, much of this has been repaired, and the building, overall, is in good condition.

A letter of support for the proposal, submitted by the current owner, Katherine Crist Fluri, confirms that the cabin was built by Katherine Fort Heine Cole, the great-great aunt of Ms. Fluri. Ms. Fluri reports that the cabin was a full-time residence until 1985 and that she recently inherited the property through her mother.

Scope of Work: The applicant proposes to demolish the majority of the principal dwelling and construct a new house utilizing the existing foundation and granite chimney. The application states that the applicants initially intended to purchase the property, update the building and add an addition. The applicant has provided the following reasons why demolition is currently proposed:

- 1) Initial size was estimated at just under 1500 square feet. In reality it is not quite 1000 square feet of interior livable space.
- 2) Due to the moratorium on building in the watershed, a first floor expansion is prohibited.
- 3) Existing roof and load bearing walls do not meet structural code and cannot support a second story.
- 4) Existing foundation has sustained significant water and termite damage.
- 5) Well system in the basement must be completely removed and replaced.
- 6) The house is not grounded and creates a significant electrical safety hazard.

The applicant plans to deconstruct the house and incorporate the wood flooring, doors, roof timbers and sinks as possible, and otherwise salvage and donate or sell the other parts of the cabin.

For the construction of the new home, the existing foundation will be repaired and reinforced, so that the new structure can be built on the existing footprint. The existing specimen trees and existing topography around the house will be maintained. There are some areas of existing concrete and stone

patios and walkways around the house, which will be removed and reduce the impervious impacts of the site by at least 500 square feet. The new structure will be a 2-story house and will cantilever out in varying amounts up to 18 inches, so the foundation will be recessed and minimally visible, except along the wall containing the existing chimney. The existing log cabin roof extends beyond the foundation about 2 feet, so the cantilevering of the new structure will utilize the impervious square footage into the new design.

The application states that the exterior of the new home will be:

- 1) Siding - HardiePlank smooth lap siding with a 7-inch exposure in the color Light Mist (a light gray) and HardieTrim corner boards in the color Arctic White.
- 2) Foundation - A parged block foundation.
- 3) Porch Railings - The first and second floor porch railings will be wood, painted in the color Arctic White.
- 4) Porch Decking - Natural Ipe wood.
- 5) Porch Ceilings - Hardie beaded porch panel in the color Arctic White with white ceiling fans in the style Casablanca installed on the second floor porch.
- 6) Porch posts – Craftsman style porch posts 11"x11"x36" (h) painted base posts with taper to 7.5"x7.5" at the top.
- 7) Windows - Andersen 200 series vinyl clad wood windows consisting of double hung, casement and awning with 4:4, 6 and 8 divided lights.
- 8) Doors - The front entry and side doors will be Therma Tru Craftsman style painted wood doors, to be painted Benjamin Moore Hale Navy. The Church Road front entry door will be a 3 light over two panel Craftsman style door surrounded by two 5-light sidelights and a 5-light transom. The side door will be a 9 light over two panel door. The second floor porch doors will be a set of 10-light French doors. The storm door will be a white aluminum full view Andersen door.
- 9) Roof and Ridge Vents - Tamko architectural shingles in the color Charcoal.
- 10) Gutters and Downspouts – White galvalume half and full round with complimenting downspouts.
- 11) Gable Vent – 23-inch round wood vent painted Arctic White.
- 12) Exterior lights – Craftsman style black metal outdoor wall lantern. Two lanterns will frame the front door and one lantern will be placed next to the side door.
- 13) Stone chimney – The existing stone chimney will be retained but will be extended beyond the second floor of the new building per code requirements.

HPC Review Criteria and Recommendations:

Demolition

Section 301 of the Historic Preservation Commission Rules of Procedure

Section 301 of the Rules of Procedure outlines the process and information needed in an application for demolition. Section 301 explains that documentary evidence must be submitted to support the demolition request. The Rules of Procedure also state that before the Commission acts on an application for demolition, they shall determine whether the building is a Structure of Unusual Importance, which is defined by Section 302 (page 15) of the Rules of Procedure as:

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

If the Commission determines the structure is a Structure of Unusual Importance, the process to be followed is described in Section 303 of the Rules.

If the Commission determines the structure is 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. The standards for review in Section 16.607 are:

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

There is also an alternative process as established in Section 304.B where the Commission can ask the applicant if they are willing to have the Commission assist in trying to develop an economically feasible plan to retain the structure or explore alternatives to demolition. One alternative to demolition would be the construction of an addition, but that is not permitted currently within the Tiber Hudson Watershed.

The building does not appear to be of Unusual Importance, as its loss would not cause great damage to the character and integrity of the historic district. This building is not a vernacular historic style of Ellicott City, and it does not architecturally relate to any other historic property in the district. The building is not visible from the public right-of-way and is only visible from one neighboring property, which also is not a contributing structure to the historic district.

However, the building is historic as it dates to 1936 and is approximately 83 years old. The building was a kit home and was expanded over the years. The building has been reportedly vacant since the 1980s, but as a result, is preserved and not altered. The building appears in good condition; the windows are operable, the paint is not peeling, and no rotting is observable. The windows are unique, even in areas that were added onto (which are most likely historic additions at this point in time, too). The windows are true divided light, mostly casement windows. There was significant craft and skill displayed in the construction and alteration of the home, as seen in the notching in of the cranks for the casement windows in the porch enclosure (see Figure 12).

The structural integrity is not sufficient to add a second story, according to the applicant's contractor, but moreover, adding a second story to the existing structure would destroy the architectural integrity of the house as it would require removal of the peaked ceilings and exposed beams. The house presents unique challenges in its current configuration, for example, to enter the basement, doors in the kitchen must be shut and a trap door in the floor opened up.

New Construction

Chapter 8.B: New Construction: Principal Structures, New Building Design

- 1) *Chapter 8.B.1 on Size, Scale and Form recommends:*
 - a. *Design new buildings to be compatible with neighboring buildings in bulk, ratio of height to width and the arrangement of door and window openings.*

- b. Use a roof shape and slope that echoes the roof forms of neighboring historic buildings.*

The proposed new construction complies with these recommendations. The new building will utilize the foundation and small footprint of the existing structure and will be compatible in bulk and scale to the neighboring structure. The new building will be a two-story structure, but will still have two one-story wings, which mitigate the potential for bulk appearance of the new building.

The roof shape will be a simple cross gable roof with a hipped roof over the front porch and a hipped roof on the side additions, which are shapes compatible with historic buildings in the vicinity.

2) *Chapter 8.B.2 on Details recommends:*

- a. Use elements such as porch shapes, window or door openings, dormer style and spacing and other characteristic that echo historic Ellicott City buildings.*
- b. In areas where front porches or stoops occur on most buildings facing the same street, incorporate porches or stoops similar in scale to existing designs into new building designs.*
- c. Design entrances and windows to be similar in scale and proportion to those on nearby historic buildings, particularly for new buildings close to a public way. Simple transoms and sidelights can be appropriately used. Double-hung, vertically proportioned windows (with the height close to twice the width) are most often appropriate. A variety of window pane patterns can be used, but windows should have true divided lights or give the appearance of true divided lights with a permanently applied exterior grille.*

The proposal complies with Guidelines recommendations a-c above. There will be a variety of window types on the house, such as paired, triple or single double-hung windows and casement windows with simulated divided lights, all of which are characteristics of other historic buildings found in Ellicott City. The doors will be similar in style to other historic doors found in Ellicott City. The front façade of the house will face in the direction of Church Road, as the current structure does. However, Church Road is not visible at all from this property and the house is likewise not visible from the road. The first-floor front porch and second floor front porch will overlook the property fronting Court House Drive. The porches will be small and proportionate in scale to the rest of the house.

3) *Chapter 8.3 on Materials recommends:*

- a. Use materials common to the historic district, such as wood siding, wood shingles, brick, stone or stucco, and compatible with materials used in the immediate vicinity. Along upper Main Street, upper Church Road and Fels Lane, wood siding is dominant and is most appropriate for new buildings...*
- b. Where wood siding is used, use painted siding compatible with the forms of traditional siding found in the historic district. Substitute siding materials can be appropriate if they are similar in width, profile and texture to wood siding. (The detailed appearance of substitute siding materials is less important for new buildings not visible from a public way.)*
- c. Use roofing materials compatible with materials used elsewhere in the historic district. Asphalt shingles should generally be flat, uniform in color and texture and of an unobtrusive color.*

The siding on the new structure will be a lap HardiePlank in a smooth texture, which is a substitute material that is similar in width, profile and texture to wood siding. As noted above, the house will not

be visible from the public right-of-way. The house will utilize wood in the construction of the porch railings and flooring. The windows will be a vinyl clad wood, which maintains a profile like a true divided light. The roofing will be a charcoal color asphalt architectural shingle, which is found on many historic structures in the district. The proposed materials comply with the Guideline recommendations.

Chapter 8.C: New Construction: Principal Structures, Siting New Buildings

4) Chapter 8.C recommends:

- a. *New buildings should respect historic development patterns....within the constraints of the particular building lot, new buildings should maintain setbacks from streets and other buildings consistent with those of nearby historic buildings and should avoid blocking important views of Ellicott City and its terrain.*
- b. *Preserve the prevailing spacing between buildings...where buildings are separated by side yards, new buildings should maintain the side yards.*

The new building will be constructed on the existing footprint of the historic house and will maintain the existing front orientation toward Court House Drive. The application complies with these recommendations.

Staff Recommendation to the HPC: Staff recommends the HPC determine if the house is a Structure of Unusual Importance. If the HPC determines it is not a Structure of Unusual Importance, Staff recommends the HPC approve the application as submitted for the demolition and new construction, with the plan to salvage and reuse as many of the existing materials as possible or allow the deconstruction and removal of the house in its entirety for the opportunity to relocate it as a cabin.

Testimony: Mr. Shad swore in Larry and Heather Gaetano. Mr. Shad asked if the applicants had information they would like to share. Mr. and Mrs. Gaetano gave background on their search to find a home within the Historic District and their commitment and investment into Ellicott City. Mrs. Gaetano said once they found the property in question, they wanted to purchase it and build an addition on the house by adding a story. After having inspectors and builders come out to review the property, the couple were told the house as is was not safe or economically feasible to use it as it is.

Mr. Gaetano explained to get access into the basement of the house, all doors in the kitchen have to be shut and then the floor in the kitchen opens up to access the basement. Mrs. Gaetano said she and her husband selected builders that have worked in the Historic District before. She said she understood taking down something that is historical is emotional and that was not what she and her husband had intended to do, but explained the building is not safe to move into as is.

Mr. Gaetano explained they do not plan to build a large building or subdivide the property. Mr. Gaetano showed a PowerPoint rendering of the final concept of the proposed new house to the Commission. Mr. Gaetano said that they plan on staying in the existing footprint of the current house and will not be taking down trees in the yard. Mr. Gaetano said they plan to incorporate the existing chimney into the new house.

Ms. Tennor said the aerial shown in the PowerPoint answered her first question as a site plan was not included in the submission. Ms. Tennor asked if the applicants would retain the existing driveway. Mr. Gaetano said they would be retaining the current driveway. Ms. Tennor asked if the applicants would build a garage on the property. Mr. Gaetano referenced where an existing garage stood in the aerial image of the property and said that they would not need to build a garage as they already had a detached garage. There was previously another outbuilding, a shed next to the garage but it fell down and was removed. Mr. Gaetano pointed out there are two driveways on the property and the second

driveway is overgrown so it was not visible on the aerial, but it can be used to access Court House Drive. Mr. Gaetano said the applicants have no intention of using the second driveway and want to talk to the County about removing it and possibly put in gravel to replace the pavement.

Ms. Tennor and Mr. Roth discussed the existing historic house. Mr. Reich said he had a problem with the demolition and explained that while the house does not fit into the style of the rest of Ellicott City, the Historic District has a mixture of different styles and eras of construction. He said the house is a 1936 retro log house and has historic value in its own regard and will probably end up on the Historic Sites Inventory. Ms. Tennor said there is no such structure like it that she is aware of in the Historic District.

Mr. Reich said he did not see anything regarding the condition of the house that would require the house to be torn down, except that it was not big enough for the applicants use. Mrs. Gaetano explained there are electrical issues with the house. Mr. Reich said that the electric in the house can be redone. Mr. Gaetano explained that the beams supporting the roof are 32 inches apart, are not to Code, and said the roof was not insulated. Mr. Gaetano said the house would have to be taken apart and put back together. Mr. Reich suggested the applicants use rigid insulation.

Mr. Gaetano said all the pipes for heating and cooling are wrapped in asbestos and encased in the floor. The pipes are only exposed in the crawl space on either side. The foundation of the house itself has suffered so much water damage that the builders would have to pull sections of the foundation apart fill with rebar and concrete. Mr. Gaetano is also unsure if the house has footers. Mr. Reich asked why the applicants would not renovate the house as it is. Mr. Gaetano said that so much of the house would have to be taken apart as well as the basement. Mr. Reich said the basement could be filled in. Mr. Gaetano explained there is a well in the basement. Mr. Reich said that a new well could be built. Mr. Roth and the applicants discussed the mix of plumbing materials in the house.

Mr. Gaetano explained that the couple would like to repurpose some of the existing materials of the house in the proposed house such as the hardwood floor, doors, fixtures, and sink. The owner of the current house wrote in the contract that she has the first right of refusal on the logs from the exterior of the house. Mr. Gaetano said he hoped to be able to use some of the logs to rebuild the garage because the current garage is termite infested.

Mr. Taylor said the Commission should determine if this structure is of unusual importance. Ms. Holmes asked the Commission to review page 14 of the staff report which detailed the requirements of structures of unusual importance. Mr. Reich said the only qualification the house could fit into was number four, the house is unusual because it is the only example of a kit house from the 1930s in the district, but he did not think there is anything else contributing to the house characteristics that fit with the normal considerations that are looked at when determining a structure of unusual importance. Ms. Tennor agreed stating that the house is not visible. Mr. Reich said the house has historic value in his opinion. Mr. Reich further explained the applicants are saying to renovate the house to its original condition is too costly, but it could be renovated, it just does not fit this applicant's finances or needs. Mr. Reich acknowledged it would be nice to have an owner that will not subdivide the property. The proposed house fits into the characteristics of houses the Commission look for that go into the district such as colors, windows, and massing. Mr. Reich said he has trouble getting rid of a historic structure because it could be renovated but understands the applicant's plight.

Ms. Tennor said when the house was built it was a place to put a cabin and now residential has developed around the cabin. Mr. Reich said it is nice that the house cannot be seen from the road. Ms. Tennor said the house is unusual, but it is not of unusual importance. Mr. Roth said he did not think the structure was of unusual importance. Mr. Reich asked for Mr. Shad and Ms. Zoren to weigh in on the

discussion. Mr. Shad said that he agreed that it was not of unusual importance and Ms. Zoren concurred.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved the Commission find that this is not a Structure of Unusual Importance. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

Testimony: Mr. Reich asked if the demolition would move forward as it was put forth in the presentation drawings, by saving and reusing materials, such as the stones in the chimney. Mr. Gaetano clarified that they would be saving the whole chimney and reiterated the owner may want to ship some of the logs back to Chicago, but that the applicants would like to use any logs they can to use as an accent inside their home or to restore the garage.

Regarding the proposed demolition, Mr. Roth said that from a practical standpoint he does not think anyone would renovate the house, he thinks the house would fall over eventually from demolition by neglect. The house does not have any insulation and has galvanized pipes that need to be replaced.

Ms. Tennor said the appeal of the structure is that it is associated with the look of recreation, more than a residence. Mr. Reich said without the moratorium the applicants could have built a house next to the building.

Mr. Taylor asked the Commission how and whether the demolition of the house would impact the Historic District and surrounding neighbors. Mr. Reich noted that it would affect the Historic District if it was on Main Street and the fact that the house is in the woods makes it easier to overlook, however valuable historic buildings are often removed from the main thoroughfare, an example Monticello. Ms. Tennor pointed out that many of the main historic structures in Sykesville are far away from Main Street proper, and the context matters. Mr. Roth said that with the Lawyers Hill Guidelines these issues are specifically addressed, the environmental setting is a distinguishing characteristic in that Historic District, but the same verbiage is not used in the Ellicott City Guidelines. Mr. Shad asked if anyone in the audience would like to speak or comment on the case.

Public Testimony

Mr. Shad swore in Gary Segal. Mr. Segal said he was there to testify in favor of the proposal, and said he will be a neighbor to Mr. and Mrs. Gaetano. Mr. Segal said that all the bigger houses on Church Road were re-zoned to RR to prevent subdivisions, but this house did not make it in to the rezoning as the neighbors were not able to reach the owner. The neighbors would prefer one house rather than a whole new subdivision, but Mr. Segal reiterated he could only speak on behalf of himself. Mr. Segal said the existing log house is visible in the fall from Court House Drive and a few houses on Church Road, but the house still appears far away.

Mr. Shad swore in Jim Van Heel. Mr. Van Heel lives in a house on Merryman Street next to a property the applicants had previously wanted to purchase that washed away in the 2018 flood. Mr. Van Heel said he was there as a character witness of the applicants and spoke positively about the couple.

Mr. Shad said since the applicants were planning on reusing a lot of materials and the structure was not of Unusual Importance then he was fine with the proposal. Ms. Zoren said she was in agreeance with Mr. Shad and added she thought that some of the importance and significance of the house was in the siting of the site. She summarized that the applicants are going to preserve the site, the context and the use of the footprint of the existing log cabin and reuse certain materials.

Motion: Mr. Roth moved to approve the demolition of the structure. Ms. Tennor seconded. Mr. Reich abstained. The motion passed with four votes in favor.

Testimony: Ms. Tennor asked who was the architect that worked on the proposed house plans. Mr. Gaetano said that he worked on the architecture with the consultation of his builder and that Mr. Gaetano previously worked as a draftsman.

Ms. Zoren said she had a problem with the cantilevering of the proposed house, as it was not a historic way of building and would hover over the foundation and cost a lot structurally. Mr. Gaetano said it would not cost a lot and said most of the cantilevering would not be visible because it will be at ground level and would only be visible by the existing fireplace because cantilevering could not be done there. Ms. Zoren asked if one foot of foundation would be visible. Mr. Gaetano confirmed that one foot of foundation would not be visible.

Ms. Zoren and Mr. Gaetano discussed the proposed plumbing in relation to the cantilevered walls and insulation of the new structure.

Mrs. Gaetano said that she does not want to do something that is unsafe and if anything changes with their design, she understands that she and her husband need to come back for approval. Mr. Reich asked if the applicants are going to pull the foundation out. Mrs. Gaetano said they are going to repair the foundation. Mr. Gaetano said that anywhere the foundation cannot be repaired it will be replaced.

Mr. Roth asked about the missing footers. Mr. Gaetano said there are footers in the main home but none in the crawl spaces, but they will have their builders add them in.

Ms. Holmes read the list of the new home materials that are part of the application that are summarized on page 13 of the staff report.

Ms. Tennor asked why the applicants are only including two casement windows. Mr. Gaetano said those casement windows were located in the kitchen and no more were included as they are hard to open. Mr. Gaetano explained in the bathroom they wanted wide and narrow awning windows.

Mr. Reich said he thought the submission looks good and similar to other applications they have approved for new houses in the Historic District. Ms. Zoren said she was concerned with the pediment over the front porch, as it is a bit strange since the pediment pops out over the door. Ms. Zoren suggested making the area over the front door all shingle. Ms. Holmes asked Ms. Zoren's thoughts about making that portion of roof a complete hipped roof. Ms. Zoren agreed as the pediment popping out makes the front look awkward.

Mr. Reich asked about the detail on the railing of the front porch as the PowerPoint looks different than the submission the Commission received. Mr. Gaetano said that it had typical detailing of the railing and the slats would look like how they are depicted in the PowerPoint and the rails would look like the size of the posts. Mr. Reich said the submission had a lot going on with forms, roofs, hips and gables. Ms. Zoren suggested improving the design of the porch by tying into the side of the building to eliminate a blank space on the roofing where the porch ends. The applicants liked the idea but explained that the proposed house utilizes the existing foundation, since they cannot increase the square footage of impervious surface. The roof lines and wall lines are irregular since they make use of the existing foundation.

Motion: Mr. Reich moved to approve the plans for the new house as submitted. Mr. Roth seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

OTHER BUSINESS

Ms. Burgess covered some administrative items with the Commission. Ms. Burgess told the Commission that the County Executive's office will be issuing a press release seeking additional Commission members.

Ms. Burgess also said that representative from DPW will be regularly attending Commission meetings to keep the Commission up-to-date with flood mitigation efforts and to actively seek advice on what the Commission would like to see on future applications.

Mr. Roth moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:08. Ms. Tennor seconded. The motion was unanimously approved

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



Allan Shad, Chair



Beth Burgess, Executive Secretary



Samantha Holmes, Preservation Planner



Kaitlyn Clifford, Recording Secretary