



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

JUNE MINUTES

The sixth regular meeting for the year 2009 of the Historic District Commission was held on Thursday, June 4, 2009 in the Tyson Room II located at 8930 Stanford Boulevard in Columbia, Maryland.

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

Members absent: Samuel Crozier

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

Chairperson Lisa Badart opened the meeting at 7:05 p.m. and asked the Commission members if there were any changes to the May 7, 2009 minutes. Joseph Hauser made a motion to approve the minutes as written; Eileen Tennor seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

PLANS FOR APPROVAL

- 1) #08-31c – 3600 Fels Lane, Ellicott City, HO-763
- 2) #09-22 – 8475 Frederick Road, Ellicott City
- 3) #09-21 – 3570 Sylvan Lane, Ellicott City (continued from May)

STAFF REPORTS

#08-31c – 3600 Fels Lane, Ellicott City

Final tax credit approval

Applicant: Marian Condon

Background and Scope of Work: The Applicant has submitted documentation that \$6,000 was expended on eligible pre-approved work in June 2008 to have the exterior of the house painted and the roof replaced in-kind. The Applicant seeks \$600 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The work complies with the pre-approved work.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of final tax credit.

Testimony: The Applicant was not present to testify.

Motion: Ms. Tennor made a motion to approve the tax credit, and Ms. Badart seconded. The motion to approve passed unanimously.

#09-22 – 8475 Frederick Road, Ellicott City

Replace rear door.

Applicant: Jason Benkoski

Background and Scope of Work: The Applicant proposes to replace the existing solid rear white steel door with a 15-lite white steel door. The door is not visible from the front or side of the home. The Applicant indicated the area is frequently damp, making a wood door a poor choice.

Staff Comments: The application complies with Chapter 6.G (page 38) recommendations for possible exceptions on non-visible secondary entrances, “where these entrances already have a modern replacement door, a new door does not necessarily need to be of a historically appropriate style.”

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval.

Testimony: Jason Benkoski, the Applicant, was present, but did not testify.

Motion: Mr. Hauser made a motion to approve replacement of the door, and Ms.Tennor seconded. The motion to approve passed unanimously.

#09-21 – 3570 Sylvan Lane, Ellicott City

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

Applicant: Charles Kyler

Background and Scope of Work: This Application is being continued from the May meeting. The Applicant proposes to build an addition on the side and rear of the house. The turret feature, which posed concerns for the Commission, has been deleted and replaced with a rectangular addition with projecting bays. 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 new section of the porch will be set back 4 feet from the face of the existing porch and will be 12 feet wide (the original is 8 feet wide) by 14 feet deep, requiring the existing porch roof to be redesigned so that it can be extended over the new porch and properly wrap around the house.

Staff Comments: The wraparound porch addition and reconstruction of original porch will change the historic appearance of the front of the house. In its May 7 report, Staff recommended tax credit pre-approval for the portion of the porch that is reconstructed to match the original. Staff finds that the previous tax credit recommendation may no longer be appropriate. Chapter 6.F (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.” Based upon the discussion at the May 7 meeting and amended plans, which appear to depict a larger porch than originally proposed, it seems unlikely this guideline can be met well enough to warrant tax credits. If it can be demonstrated that the existing porch can be replaced to match the original, tax credits could be approved for the existing porch only.

Chapter 7.A of the Guidelines (page 52) recommend against using “bay windows...and similar features on additions to historic buildings unless they are in an unobtrusive location.” Staff finds the Guidelines to be unclear in this situation – bay windows can be a historically appropriate feature, however, now they are commonly associated with new construction from the 1950s to present day. There is an existing bay window on a recent addition at the side of the house, which would not be appropriate for the proposed addition. Staff has no objection to the current bay proposal because it includes projecting

walls that form the bay and is not simply a projecting window added against a flat wall. It is unusual to see a door within a projecting wall/bay window. Staff recommends the Applicant consider full-length casement windows or French doors, to mimic casement windows, which would typically be seen on this kind of feature.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends:

- 1) Approval of amended addition.
- 2) Approval of wraparound porch.
- 3) Denial of tax credit for work to porch.

Testimony: Chairperson Badart swore in the Applicant, Charles Kyler. Mr. Kyler explained he planned on installing a 15-lite French door or a 4 panel half glass/half wood door (which would look more like a window); whichever the Commission thought was more appropriate. Ms. Tennor was unclear if the Applicant was trying to mimic the front door, based on the submitted computer generated rendering. The original front door is a classic four-panel on the inside but has an arched top on the outside.

Ms. Tennor explained that it was still hard to tell what the porch roof will look like, but it looked better than the original proposal. Mr. Kyler said he met with the builder and the porch roof now makes an 8 foot return back to the house. In order for the porch to come straight across the front, it will have a gabled end, as recommended by Mr. Hauser. Ms. Tennor asked if there will be a valley between the roofs as it wraps and Mr. Kyler replied that it would. Mr. Kyler showed new drawings to Commission members. The new portion of the porch will be 10 feet wide. The Commission members discussed the drawings and individual aspects of the porch. Mr. Hauser stated that he has seen porches similar to the one Mr. Kyler proposed and thinks it is acceptable. Ms. Tennor said the new drawings are better than last month's proposal.

Mr. Hauser asked if building materials have been adequately covered, and Samantha Stoney replied that Mr. Kyler is using HardiePlank™ siding. Mr. Kyler said the windows will be 2:2 Pella® wood aluminum clad with internal and external dividing lites. Mr. Kyler explained the original house is wood German lap and they would like to continue the wood German lap across the front of the new addition and then switch to HardiePlank™. Mr. Hauser agreed and said it is important to have the siding match across the front. Mr. Kyler stated that the siding on the front porch will be removed, insulated, and replaced because some of the siding is rotting.

Mr. Hauser asked about the material of the steps, and Mr. Kyler said the existing steps are currently pressure treated lumber. He plans to use Ipe for the porch flooring and stairs. Ms. Tennor asked about the material that will be used for the foundation. Mr. Kyler said the new foundation will be under the porch and made of block and faced with stone; it will not be visible. There are plants and a trellis that will be in front of the foundation.

Mr. Hauser asked about the style of gutter that is going to be used. There is currently a mix of K and round gutters, and Mr. Kyler said he would like take down the K gutters and replace with all round gutters. Dan Bennett interjected that Mr. Kyler should make a list of materials and submit to Staff for review. Ms. Tennor asked for clarification about the list of materials, which can be submitted to Staff and does not need to come back before the HDC.

Ms. Stoney reminded the Commission to include a decision about tax credits for the porch in the motion. Mina Hilsenrath explained that the plan of the porch shown on the computer at the current meeting was not the same as the plan that was submitted with the application. The previous plan showed the porch was the width of the house, and the computer image shows the porch has been extended, making the roofline on one end considerably different. The new application looks even less in keeping with the Guidelines than when Staff made the recommendation to deny tax credit pre-approval for the porch. The Commission discussed the porch briefly and Mr. Hauser asked if he is correct in assuming that all new construction on the roof and porch does not qualify for tax credits, but repair to the existing porch might qualify for tax credits.

Ms. Badart stated her understanding that the porch is significantly different because the original porch is being removed due to deterioration and then a new, longer porch is being constructed in its place and is not eligible for tax credits.

Mr. Bennett requested that construction documents be submitted to Staff when the plans are submitted to the Department of Inspections, Licenses, and Permits for a permit. The plans will show the proposed work and should be submitted to Staff to ensure that it complies with what the Commission anticipates the construction and materials will look like and comply with the decisions made at the two HDC meetings.

Motion: Mr. Hauser made a motion to approve the application per Staff recommendations, contingent upon a complete list of materials be submitted to Staff, as well as construction drawings at the time the permit is applied for. Ms. Tennor seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous to approve.

Other Business - Discussion Items

Solar Panels: Ms. Hilsenrath asked Commission members if they had questions or comments about materials regarding solar panels that were given out at last month's meeting. Ms. Badart asked for more time to look the papers over completely before commenting. Mr. Hauser thought the recommendations were fine, and would like to see some specifications for products that are available now and in the future. Ms. Hilsenrath said no requests for solar panels have been submitted, so action of the guidelines can be deferred until another meeting.

Elections: Jim Vannoy pointed out that three members are needed for a quorum, and there are three people in attendance at this meeting. Ms. Badart recommended waiting until the July meeting to discuss elections.

Historic District Commission Code: Mr. Hauser made a motion to endorse the proposed changes to the County Code regarding the Historic District Commission. Ms. Badart seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 7:42 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