



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

APRIL MINUTES

The regularly scheduled meetings for March and April were cancelled due to lack of a quorum. A special meeting for the year 2009 of the Historic District Commission was held on Wednesday, April 15, 2009 in the Tyson Room II located at 8930 Stanford Boulevard in Columbia, Maryland.

Members present: Lisa Badart, Chairperson; Samuel Crozier and Joseph Hauser

Staff present: Samantha Stoney, Mina Hilsenrath, Dan Bennett, Jim Vannoy and Laurie Scott

Staff absent: Virginia Vargo

Mina Hilsenrath introduced Laurie Scott from the Department of Planning and Zoning who was acting as Recording Secretary. Ms. Hilsenrath also mentioned the sudden passing of Patrick Mullaly, longtime member of the Historic District Commission, and paid tribute to his years of service on the Commission. Ms. Hilsenrath also introduced Eileen Tennor, who has been nominated as a Commission member, subject to her confirmation by the County Council. Ms. Tennor is an environmental graphic designer who worked with Pat Mullaly.

Joseph Hauser opened the meeting at 7:27 p.m. in Chairperson Lisa Badart's absence. The first case did not require a quorum as it only needed advisory comments, not HDC action.

#09-17 – 7615 Washington Boulevard, Elkridge, HO-833

Applicant: Music Fair Road Limited Partnership
Site development plan with demolition.

The property is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-833, The Lloyd and Hazel T. Strickland Property also known as the Copper Stallion Inn. The Applicant proposes to demolish all structures located on the property and build a nursing home/assisted living facility with association parking and underground storm water management.

Staff Comments: The property has been documented in the Historic Sites Inventory. Staff has no objection to the proposal.

Testimony: James Forsyth, representing the Mangione family, spoke about the current condition of the buildings. He explained that the existing buildings and new construction cannot exist at the same time. Mr. Forsyth stated the buildings are listed on the Historic Sites Inventory and associated with the development of Route 1, but that there is no known association of the property with any historic event or person. The property is about 11.7 acres. Mr. Hauser asked if the intention was to install landscaping along the front, and Mr. Forsyth replied it was. Mr. Hauser asked if the landscaping will be a raised area and Mr. Forsyth replied that he did not think so. There will be approximately 16 shade trees and shrubs

lining the street along the property. Some forest land will be preserved in the rear of the property. Parking will be located in the back and on the side of the property.

Mr. Hauser stated that he would like to see the Foursquare house saved, but understands that is not possible in this case and complemented the Applicant on a great project. Mr. Forsyth explained that nursing and assisted living facilities are located in Ellicott City and Columbia, but the Route 1 area is not currently served. Mr. Crozier said he has no objection because of the need in the area for this type of facility. Mr. Forsyth explained future plans for the facility, such as a proposed medical clinic. Ultimately, there will be 163 or 164 units, including the nursing facility and assisted living. Tremendous growth is projected for the area, and the project has been laid out so that there is flexibility on the site. Bill Myers and Associates are the architects.

Comments: The Commission had no other advisory comments.

The meeting was suspended until 8:15 when a quorum was achieved. Lisa Badart, Chairperson, arrived and recognized the passing of Patrick Mullaly and that he will be missed by his family and the HDC. She asked if the members had read the minutes and if there was a motion to accept. Mr. Hauser made a motion, and Sam Crozier seconded. The vote was unanimous to accept the minutes as written.

#07-40c – 3641 Sylvan Lane, Ellicott City

Final tax credit approval

Applicant: Thomas and Sharon Harman

The Applicants have submitted documentation that \$35,195 was expended on eligible pre-approved work for installation of siding. The Applicant seeks \$3,519.50 in final tax credits.

The Applicant also seeks an additional \$853.40 from \$8,534.00 spent on emergency foundation repair due to flooding from heavy rain last fall. This repair work was not pre-approved.

Staff Comments: The tax credit was pre-approved in November 2007 for the repair and installation of siding. The foundation work was not pre-approved, and the County Code defines eligible work as: (b) after the owner receives initial approval of an application for a certificate of eligibility; and (c) in it with the application for which initial approval was given.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of pre-approved work for \$3,519.50 in final tax credits.

Testimony: The Applicant agrees with the Staff recommendation.

Motion: Mr. Crozier made a motion to accept the tax credit as recommended by Staff, and Mr. Hauser seconded. The vote was unanimous to accept the recommendation by Staff and approve the tax credit.

#09-10 – 3736 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City

Install signs.

Applicant: Scott Alpert, LLC T/A Patapsco Motor Sports

The Applicant proposes to install two signs on the exterior of the business, one flat mounted and one projecting sign. The logo consists of blue and green text. Both signs have a white background. Additional proposed text is black.

The proposed flat mounted sign will be 18 inches by 72 inches for a total of 9 square feet. This sign will be mounted to the stone wall with screws and anchors. The sign will contain the business logo and three lines of text, which read:

Electric Bikes, Scooters,
RV & Accessories
Sales, Service, Rentals & Tours

The proposed sign on the front of the building (fronting Old Columbia Pike) will be a double-sided projecting sign. This sign will be attached to a black ornate scroll bracket. The bracket will be attached to the stone wall with screws and anchors. The projecting sign will be 18 inches by 29 inches for a total of 3.6 square feet and will contain the business logo for Patapsco Motor Sports.

Staff Comments: Chapter 11.A recommends “Emphasize the identification of the establishment rather than an advertising message on the face of the sign.” Staff recommends the text on the flat mounted sign be simplified to comply with the recommendation. The text on the logo of the temporary banner was difficult to read from the parking lot. If the additional text was eliminated from the flat mounted sign, the dimensions of the sign could be adjusted and the size of the logo could be increased so that the logo is legible from the parking lot. Such a redesign would make the sign more consistent with others in the vicinity.

The projecting sign complies with Chapter 11 recommendations. The Howard County Sign Code requires that projecting signs have a minimum clearance of 10 feet above a sidewalk. The Applicant has not indicated the clearance of the projecting sign.

Chapter 11.A recommends “On masonry walls, drill into the mortar joints rather than into the stone or brick to attach fasteners for the brackets supporting the sign.” The bracket and flat mounted sign should be drilled into the mortar, if possible.

Sign Permits are required from the Department of Inspections, Licenses and Permits.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval provided the signs comply with Chapter 11 recommendations, specifically:

- Simplified text on the flat mounted sign.
- The projecting sign meet Sign Code clearance requirements of the Department of Inspections, Licenses and Permits.
- Holes should be drilled into the mortar, not the stone, if possible.

Testimony: The Applicant, Scott Alpert of 6246 Woodcrest Drive, Ellicott City, MD was sworn in by Chairperson Badart. Mr. Alpert testified that he agrees with Staff recommendations to remove the additional text and only use the logo as shown on the front sign for the signage on the rear of the building.

Mr. Hauser asked which sign has a bracket, and Mr. Alpert explained it is the sign on the front of the building, facing Old Columbia Pike. The rear sign will be flat mounted on the mortar of the building. Mr. Hauser suggested framing the sign with a painted blue border, so that the sign does not look modern.

Samantha Stoney asked if the Commission had any comments on new dimensions for the sign. She explained that once the additional text is eliminated, the current dimensions will be too long. Ms. Hilsenrath said that Staff had no problem with size of the proposed rear sign (9 square feet), only with the extent of the proposed text. A total square footage of 9 square feet is in conformance with the Design Guidelines and is consistent with other signs nearby. Ms. Hilsenrath said that the Applicant's graphic designer can guide him regarding correct proportions for the sign with his logo, with the understanding that the sign is to remain 9 square feet in area.

Mr. Hauser asked Mr. Alpert about the products the store will carry. Mr. Alpert said there is a large yard in the rear facing the parking lot where bicycles can be displayed during the day and moved indoors at night. Mr. Alpert said the merchandise will be displayed on the yard, not on the sidewalk. Mr. Hauser and Mr. Crozier expressed some concern about the display of merchandise. Mr. Bennett explained that the merchandise is not on the public right of way, but on the yard, which is private property. Jim Vannoy said that the Zoning Division of the Department of Planning and Zoning probably has jurisdiction over displaying merchandise, not the Commission.

Motion: Mr. Hauser made a motion to approve the Staff recommendations for the signage, with the decorative border. Sam Crozier seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous to approve the application.

#09-11 – 8054 Main Street, Ellicott City

Install sign.

Applicant: Andies Candies

The Applicant proposes to install a flat mounted sign. The sign will be 43 inches wide by 24 inches high for a total of 7.2 square feet. The sign will be constructed on MDO plywood with waterproof resins and a smooth finish. The sign will be located just above the first floor in the center of the façade and will be flat-mounted or slightly raised by drilling 4 bolts with masonry anchors into the brick wall. Washers will be used to level and stand the sign slightly off plane of the building. The sign will read "Andies Candies & Collectibles" on three lines and is multicolor text on a white background. The sign will have a dark blue border.

Staff Comments: The size of the sign complies with Chapter 11.B guidelines for flat-mounted signs. However, the guidelines (page 80 and 81) recommend signs "use a minimum number of colors, generally no more than three" and "on masonry walls, drill into the mortar joints rather than into the stone or brick."

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval provided the signs comply with Chapter 11 recommendations, specifically:

- The number of colors is reduced to comply with the guidelines recommendations.
- Holes should be drilled into the mortar, not the brick, if possible.

Testimony: Chairperson Badart swore in the Applicant, Andrea Freedman. Ms. Freedman said that while the logo has a lot of colors, it has been the business logo for years. The logo is also very visible to passing traffic.

Jay Freedman was sworn in by Chairperson Badart. He also stated he wants to keep the original multi-color sign because it is small and in scale with the building. The colors are also consistent with a candy store.

Ms. Badart asked if the picture submitted with the application is to scale. Mr. Freedman replied he digitally added the sign onto the picture of the building as best he could. Mr. Hauser suggested a compromise by placing the multicolored sign inside the window, and placing a sign that complies with Guidelines on the exterior so that a precedent will not be set for multicolored signs.

Mr. Crozier stated he finds the background to be too white and out of character. Ms. Badart said that she is okay with the text colors as is, but agrees the white background should be toned down. She finds the idea for a window sign is acceptable, but it has a lesser impact. Ms. Hilsenrath stated that there have been several cases before the Commission in the last few months where a recommendation was made by the Commission or the Applicant to tone down a white sign to an off-white or cream.

Motion: Ms. Badart made a motion to approve the sign as submitted with the stipulation that the background be a matte finish and the color a pale cream. Mr. Crozier seconded the motion. Two members voted in favor of the motion, and one member voted in opposition. The motion passed.

#09-15 – 8501 Hill Street, Ellicott City

Exterior alteration/addition, rebuild retaining walls, walkways, patio, tax credit pre-approval.
Applicant: Judy Herrmann and Michael Starke

According to MDAT, the house dates to 1910. The Applicants propose to build a rear addition to the house and repair/rebuild site landscape features.

The Applicant proposes to enclose the rear second story porch, extending it 5 feet from the current exterior wall of the house. The enclosed porch will be supported on brick piers. The proposed windows are 1:1, consistent with the rest of the house. The fascia and trim will use Azek, a synthetic wood as the Applicants have had bad experiences with new woods rotting quickly.

The Applicants propose to add a series of four windows on the first and second floor rear walls. The Applicants also propose to add a deck on the rear right side of the house to balance the 5 foot enclosed porch extension and to provide emergency access from the second floor to the backyard. The Applicants have considered using the Azek for the new balcony or a stainable/painted wood and will return to the Commission for approval of the final material.

The materials involved in these additions/alterations are:

- Brick piers – Glen Gery Cedarcreek Papercut Series, brown
- Windows – 1:1 Anderson Woodwright Double Hung Windows, wood interior, vinyl clad exterior, white
- Fascia/trim – Azek, a paintable synthetic wood

- Exterior door – Anderson Frenchwood Hinged Patio Door, wood interior, vinyl clad exterior, white
- Siding – will match existing, #1 perfection red cedar wood shingles, stained a custom blend (approved in 1999 as HDC-09-10).
- Roof – will match existing, Tamko 3 tab Elite fiberglass/asphalt shingles in Pastel Green
- Gutters – will match existing, K-style aluminum, white

The Applicants propose to demolish and rebuild two concrete block retaining walls that are failing and damaged beyond repair. The retaining walls are necessary for the structural stability of the house and the Applicants seek tax credit pre-approval. One of the retaining walls runs parallel to the rear exterior wall of the house and prevents the hillside from collapsing into the rear exterior wall. The wall is concrete block, about 50 feet long and ranges in height from 2 feet to 8 feet. The Applicant proposes to rebuild this wall using concrete block and parge the exposed side to make it more aesthetically pleasing.

The second retaining wall runs along the northern side of the house and prevents the soil supporting the house foundation from collapsing onto the pavement below. According to previous owners, this wall was built by Howard County in the 1950s to provide the previous owner easy access to a county lane. The lane was subsequently abandoned by the County and now serves as a driveway/shared parking pad. The wall is about 70 feet long and ranges in height from 5 feet to 12 feet. The Applicants propose to replace this wall with concrete block. A portion of the wall will be moved back into the hill to create a second parking space. The Applicants also propose to build a new concrete path behind this wall to access the parking pad below. The Applicants will install guardrails on the new walls and will return to the Commission for approval when the materials have been decided upon.

There is a concrete walkway around the house which the applicants propose to replace and raise 16 inches higher. This will create a natural 4 inch step from the back door, instead of the current 20 inch difference, and will reduce the height of the new retaining wall. The existing concrete patio will be rebuilt and raised to match the height of the walkway.

There is an existing stone retaining wall that runs perpendicular to the north side of the house, which the Applicants propose to extend in order to support the new elevation of the replacement concrete patio. The materials will match the existing as closely as possible. The wall was repaired in 2000 or 2001 using matching materials.

Staff Comments: The Application complies with Chapter 7.D recommendations for new additions, “attach additions to the side or rear of a historic building to avoid altering the primary façade.” The proposed 1:1 windows, siding, roof, and gutters will match the existing house features. The Application also complies with Chapter 9.D recommendations for site elements.

On October 2007 the Commission pre-approved HDC-07-46, 8361 Court Avenue for tax credits to install retaining walls, which the Commission determined were necessary for structural stability.

The Applicants included a second tax credit application, seeking tax credits for replacement of the water supply line. This was not included on the legal ad, but is not eligible for tax credits since it does not affect the structural integrity of the house.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of work and tax credit pre-approval for the replacement of retaining walls.

Testimony: Chairperson Badart swore in the Applicant, Judy Herrmann. Ms. Herrmann explained that there are some materials that have not been decided upon, but they will bring those materials back before the Commission for approval when they have decided. She also mentioned that her tongue-and-groove wood porch has begun to rot after only four years. She also stated that she does not want to use vinyl clad windows but feels there is no other choice because the wood is not holding up.

Mr. Crozier asked if the Applicants have spoken to any engineers about the wall. Ms. Herrmann said she has spoken to several engineers but has not had the new wall officially engineered and does not have specifications yet. She has been told that the wall must be replaced. Mr. Crozier told her that there are several block alternatives to reinforced concrete. Ms. Herrmann said she is planning to use concrete block reinforced with rebar, because the wall is too close to the house and interlocking blocks cannot be used.

Dan Bennett mentioned the wall that is bowing and cracking, and the Applicants had applied for installation of a walkway on top of the wall. Installation of a walkway will require a handrail. Ms. Herrmann stated that she would rather have a shorter wall with a handrail than a taller wall. Mr. Bennett reminded her that she needs a 42 inch barrier between one elevation and the other.

Ms. Herrmann and Mr. Crozier talked at length about the retaining wall and its design, giving alternatives for design, materials, and construction. Ms. Herrmann said that her architect has suggested a Japanese drainage design whereby a pipe comes through weep holes in the wall, there is a metal rod with a chain and the water trickles down the chain. She has also been told that interlocking block wall cannot be used on certain portions of the retaining wall. Either concrete block or poured concrete must be used.

Mr. Hauser mentioned that he has seen a lot of shrinkage with the Azek proposed for the fascia and recommended that the Applicant look for an alternative material.

Motion: Mr. Hauser made a motion to approve the application as submitted and with Staff recommendations, with the stipulation that the Applicant seek staff approval for the color on the retaining walls. Mr. Crozier seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#09-16 – 8391 Main Street, Ellicott City

Demolition/addition, replace windows and doors, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Donald Taylor

According to MDAT, the building dates to 1920. The Applicant proposes to remove two one-story additions and a two-story enclosed porch on the rear of the structure due to deterioration and construct a new two-story addition. The new addition will be 1,862 square feet located on the rear of the structure. The new addition will consists of:

- Exterior Wall - Dryvit EIFS stucco over masonry construction , color “Pure Cream,” #386A Sandpebble finish
- Windows (new and replacement) – Bridgewood composite double-hung, 6:6, simulated divided lite with exterior muntins, prefinished white
- Cornice – wood with aluminum gutters and downspouts, white to match existing
- Doors (new and replacement) – Therma-tru smooth 6-panel, insulated fiberglass, painted to match existing color

- Exterior light fixture (to be located at side and rear entry doors) – Progress black
- Roof Shingles – will match existing

The Applicant also proposes to replace the windows and doors on the primary historic structure with the kind mentioned above. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval for the whole application.

Staff Comments: The Application is consistent with Chapter 7.A recommendations for new additions, “attach additions to the side or rear of a historic building to avoid altering the primary façade” and “design additions in a manner that makes clear what is historic and what is new. Additions may be contemporary in design or may reference design motifs from the historic building but should not directly imitate the historic building.” For frame buildings the guidelines recommend using wood siding or shingles similar to appearance to the siding or shingles on the building, but state that a compatible material may be used for additions if wood siding is not a viable option. The Dryvit specification sheet indicates that it provides moisture protection, which may be an issue for the proposed addition against the retaining wall.

The proposed composite windows on the addition comply with Chapter 7.A.4 recommendations alternative to true divided lite windows, “a possible alternative is windows that do not have divided lights but have permanent exterior grilles appropriately detailed to be compatible with historic wood windows.”

For the historic façade, the guidelines recommend repairing wooden windows when possible and recommends against installing vinyl or metal windows in highly visible locations. Staff is not familiar with the cellular composite material the Applicant is using and therefore cannot make judgment on it as an alternative to wood.

Tax credits are not eligible for new construction. However, the replacement of exterior features on the historic structure, such as the replacement of windows and doors, may be eligible. The windows on the building are wooden (replaced in 1981) and replacement would be with the new cellular material. The front doors are wood, but date to 1981 when the original doors were removed. The guidelines (page 40) recommend replacing windows with “features that fit the original openings and are of the same style, material, finish and window pane configuration.” For replacement of doors, the guidelines (page 36) recommend, “when a new door is needed, it should reflect the character of the original door. Simple paneled doors of wood or wood and glass are usually best.” The location of the windows and doors on the front of the house are highly visible from the sidewalk and should be replaced in-kind.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of demolition and addition. Staff recommends Approval of new doors and windows on the addition only. Staff recommends Denial of tax credit pre-approval as the alterations do not meet eligible requirements.

Testimony: Ms. Badart swore in Don Taylor of Dorsey Hall Drive, who represented the Applicants. Mr. Taylor brought a sample of the composite window. He spoke about the benefits of the maintenance free material, explaining that it still has the profile of a wood window. Mr. Taylor showed the various trims and molding options for the windows and indicated he would like to use brick molding on all windows, including the historic structure.

Mr. Hauser asked how much the addition will increase the building footprint. Mr. Taylor responded that it will increase by about 800 square feet. Mr. Taylor pointed out to Commission members the current one-story addition and enclosed porch, which will be demolished. The replacement will be a two-story

addition that will be constructed within inches of the existing retaining wall. Mr. Hauser asked if the addition will be visible and Mr. Taylor replied that the addition will not likely be visible except for a portion that may be visible from the side yard of the adjacent house. Mr. Taylor brought a sample of the Dryvit finish, which will be a color similar to the historic house.

Mr. Taylor explained to Ms. Badart that the existing windows are wood and the intent is to keep the same lite pattern. Squirrels damaged the interior muntins on the windows, making it necessary to replace the windows. The two doors on the front are wood doors. For security reasons, the Applicants would like to change the doors but a sample was not available. The door will be six-panel smooth finish fiberglass. Mr. Crozier asked about the side door on the new addition and Mr. Taylor said there is no accessible entrance but they would like to make one.

Mr. Hauser agrees with the Staff recommendations. He thinks the windows in the existing house need to be replaced with wood windows and pointed out that the Commission cannot approve the proposed window if the glass is tinted. Mr. Taylor explained the tint is not being proposed, but was the only available sample. The sample was intended to show the window profile. Mr. Hauser said the doors should be historic wood doors, not smooth finish doors. The doors should match other nearby doors and possibly have one lite over two panels. The windows should be wood and match the profile of the windows that are there. The proposed windows for the addition are okay. Mr. Hauser does not want to see brick mold on the façade windows because it would change the character of the building. Mr. Hauser noted there is a stipple effect on the sample Dryvit and in a historic area the finish should be the smoothest possible to make it look more like an antique stucco masonry building. Mr. Taylor stated that the Dryvit does come in a finer finish.

Mr. Taylor asked if a tax credit would be available if a change to wood windows is made. Ms. Stoney replied that changing the material to wood would be eligible for tax credits.

Ms. Badart, after looking at an old photograph of the building provided by Ms. Stoney, asked if there would be any consideration in removing the shutters from the building. Mr. Crozier asked Ms. Stoney if she knew the date of the photograph, but the date is unknown. Ms. Stoney explained that any costs incurred in removing the shutters would be eligible for tax credits because the shutters are not original to the building.

The Commission began to discuss formulating motion. Ms. Badart recommended approving the back addition as submitted with sand finish on the Dryvit in the color as submitted and new windows as submitted, white, with clear glass, and standard brick mold.

Mr. Hauser recommended that, if the windows cannot be repaired, the Applicant bring in a sample of the new sash backs, to be subject to Staff approval. The new window sash should mimic the 6:6 lite configuration of the existing windows. Mr. Hauser expressed concern over the width of the muntins on the new windows, which should be about 7/8".

Ms. Badart recommended the doors be replaced with a Colonial six-panel wood painted the same color and the shutters be removed.

Ms. Badart recommended tax credit pre-approval for replacement wood windows and wood doors in the front and the removal of the shutters if there are costs involved.

Motion: Mr. Hauser made a motion to approve the recommendations as stated and Mr. Crozier seconded. The vote was unanimous to approve.

#09-18 – 3757 Church Road, Ellicott City

Emergency exterior repairs/replacement for foundation/retaining wall, porch, driveway, siding, shutters, painting. Tax credit pre-approval for all work.

Applicant: Amy and William Noggle

According to MDAT, the property dates to 1920.

The Applicants requested an emergency addition to the April 2 meeting to make repairs to the front porch, which is collapsing. The Applicants believe the damage to the porch was caused by water runoff coming down Church Road, over the driveway apron, and into the front yard. The front driveway is cracked in several places, allowing water to drain toward the garage foundation, causing damage. The concrete driveway will be replaced with brick and the driveway apron will be repaved.

The porch deck is a concrete slab, which will be torn out to provide access to the porch support wall. The Applicants propose to replace the porch deck with fir or mahogany tongue-and-groove 2 ¼ inch to 3 inch wide or brick. The existing support wall is buckling and will be replaced by a new retaining wall that will couple as a support for the porch deck. The columns on the front porch have bowed and will be replaced with round, tapered, 6 inch to 8 inch columns made of fiberglass or wood.

The asbestos-tiled half wall on the front porch has been cracked by movement of the porch and will be replaced by a wood railing with square 1 inch by 1 inch wood balusters. The Applicants hope to salvage the porch roof and reuse the materials. The Applicants propose to restore the original lap siding under the asbestos shingles. If the siding is not salvageable, the Applicants will replace with historically accurate 6 inch wood Dutch lap siding. The Applicants propose to replace the current plastic shutters with paneled wood shutters, to be painted green, the same color as a previously approved in 2007, HDC-07-08. The historic portion of the house will be painted white, also previously approved in 2007.

Staff Comments: The work to the siding complies with Chapter 6 guidelines. For porch repair and maintenance, Chapter 6.F (page 34) recommends “replace deteriorated features with new materials as similar as possible to the original in material, design and finish.” Staff has no objection to either flooring material proposed for the porch since the current floor is concrete and no historic materials will be lost. The guidelines do not specifically recommend against the use of fiberglass columns, but for tax credit pre-approval, materials should be replaced in-kind.

The repaving of the driveway is not eligible for tax credits because the drainage issue is affecting the foundation of the garage, not the principal structure. Only principal structures are eligible for tax credits, unless outbuildings are listed separately on the Historic Sites Inventory.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of all work. Staff recommends tax credit pre-approval for all work except:

- Repaving driveway
- Fiberglass porch columns (recommend Approval if wood is used)

Testimony: Chairperson Badart swore in the Applicant, William Noggle. Mr. Noggle explained that the drain for the retaining wall is going to run across and underneath the driveway. Since the driveway is

being removed and replaced with pavers he was wondering if the driveway would then be eligible for tax credits. The drain is being installed to handle storm water runoff. The drain will be about 6 feet under the driveway.

Mr. Crozier asked for a site plan, but one was not submitted. Commission members looked at an aerial provided by staff.

Mr. Hauser said that he visited the site and that it will be a difficult job. He recommends pre-approving the tax credit for the work to the driveway, because it will eventually put the house in danger if not repaired. Mr. Crozier asked if the downspouts run away from the house, and Mr. Noggle said that they do.

Mr. Hauser asked if all of the asbestos tile will be removed from the front. Mr. Noggle said he plans to, but he has not priced out the removal. The porch currently has a half wall and the Applicant is going to remove the wall, which is cracking from movement of the porch. The Applicant will then install a full length column and a railing with square balusters.

Mr. Crozier expressed concern over replacing the solid asbestos porch wall with an open railing. Mr. Hauser explained there are other houses in the Historic District that are similar and the solid walls tend to have cedar shingles to match the shingles on the house, but that is not the case with this house which has German lap siding behind the asbestos. Mr. Crozier asked if the porch wall was currently asbestos over wood and Mr. Noggle replied that it probably is. The Commission discussed the issue of replacing a solid wall with an open rail. Mr. Hauser explained that the asbestos is likely over an open rail, that there is nothing underneath. Mr. Hauser said he didn't think German lap siding would be under the asbestos porch half wall and that he has never seen it used that way before.

Mr. Noggle said that the porches in the back will be two tier porches with open railing with columns so he would prefer to have the front porch match the back of the house. Mr. Crozier wants to find out what material is under the half wall. Mr. Hauser suggested looking in the neighborhood for foursquare houses and comparing the type of rails used. Mr. Bennett referred Commission members to the last page of the application shows what Mr. Noggle has in mind. Mr. Crozier said the proposed column and rail will change the character of the house. Mr. Noggle stated that he and his wife have looked for historic pictures of their house but have been unable to locate any. Mr. Hauser said there is a similar house at 3615 Fels Lane. Mr. Crozier would like to see the historic character maintained with the $\frac{3}{4}$ column and $\frac{1}{4}$ base, with a solid half wall. Ms. Badart would like to see the $\frac{3}{4}$ column and $\frac{1}{4}$ base rebuilt, regardless of whether it is solid or an open railing. Ms. Hilsenrath asked if Staff should look at existing houses in the neighborhood to see what styles exist to find a possible solution.

Mr. Crozier brought up the tax credit issue explaining that new columns and railings would not qualify for tax credits, whereas putting it back historically would qualify. The Commission began to discuss formulating a motion and Mr. Crozier clarified that the railing is the second choice and not the first choice in the restoration. The first choice would be to keep a solid wall. He asked for clarification about the railing receiving tax credits because it is a new design. Ms. Stoney concurred that the new railing would not be eligible for tax credits, but keeping the $\frac{3}{4}$ column and $\frac{1}{4}$ base would be eligible. Ms. Badart requested further clarification, asking if the wall is opened up and reveals an open railing, would it then be eligible for tax credits. Mr. Crozier confirmed that it would.

Motion: Mr. Hauser made a motion to approve the application as presented, including adding on tax credits for the driveway. For the rail sections on the front porch, the Applicant would come back to Staff

for approval, knowing there is concern to maintain the historic significance. Staff would then make the decision for tax credits on the railings.

Ms. Hilsenrath requested clarification about the tax credits for the driveway, whether it was removal or replacement or both. The Commission clarified that the Applicant should return to Staff for approval of driveway replacement material.

Mr. Crozier seconded the motion. The vote to approve was unanimous.

#08-38c – 4688 Beechwood Road, Ellicott City

Final tax credit approval.

Applicant: Allan S. Danoff

The Applicant has submitted documentation that \$24,200 was expended on eligible pre-approved work for exterior wood fascia, soffit and window frame repair and painting of wood siding. The Applicant seeks \$2,420.00 in final tax credits.

Staff Comments: The tax credit application was pre-approved in July 2008 and complies with pre-approved work.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of final tax credit for \$2,420.00.

Testimony: The Applicant was not present.

Motion: Mr. Hauser made a motion to approve, and Ms. Badart seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

#09-13 – 4688 Beechwood Road, Ellicott City, HO-455 (Idle-A-While)

Tax credit pre-approval for porch repairs.

Applicant: Allan S. Danoff

The property is listed on the Howard County Historic Sites Inventory as HO-455, commonly known as Judge Stewart's House.

The Applicant proposes to paint and make repairs to porch columns, banisters and floor. The Applicant will replace areas of wood rot as necessary and seeks tax credit pre-approval. The paint will be the same color approved last year for external trim.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of work for tax credit pre-approval.

Testimony: The Applicant was not present.

Motion: Mr. Hauser made a motion to approve, and Ms. Badart seconded. The motion to approve passed unanimously.

#09-12 – 3899 College Ave., Ellicott City, HO-354

Restore stone outbuilding and house, tax credit pre-approval.

Applicant: Geoffrey Hermanstorfer

The Lilburn Smokehouse located in the Ellicott City Historic District and listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-354, dates to 1857 and is the only known granite, three-story smokehouse in Howard County. The Applicant proposes to restore the Smokehouse to its original condition and will use the “train station” method of construction (as shown on page 26 of the Guidelines). The Applicant proposes to replace missing stones and repoint the mortar on the Lilburn Mansion Smokehouse using existing materials and mortar consistent with the house. The Applicant also proposes to restore the main house in the same method. The main house is listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as HO-353. The Applicant seeks tax credit pre-approval.

Staff Comments: The work is consistent with Chapter 6.C guidelines for masonry repair.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval of work and tax credit pre-approval.

Testimony: The Applicant was not present.

Discussion: Mr. Hauser questioned whether the Applicant intends to re-point the entire Lilburn Mansion, and Ms. Stoney replied that she thinks re-pointing will only be done in certain areas. Mr. Hauser asked that the record reflect that he does not know who the contractor from Oella is, but that some recent work in Oella has been done using straight Portland and sand for re-pointing of brick walls. As a result retaining walls are collapsing in Oella. Re-pointing material(s) should match what is already on the building. He pointed out that the Commission cannot say anything about a contractor but can specify that the re-pointing is done correctly. Tax credits will be approved contingent on seeing the sample of the mortar and the materials in the mortar. Ms. Stoney explained the Applicant is also applying for state tax credits. Mr. Bennett would like to see a sample on the building, against the existing mortar so Staff can see the continuity. Mr. Bennett would also like to see a certification that the mortar meets MHT standards.

Motion: Mr. Hauser made a motion to approve the application for tax credits, with the stipulation that the Applicant come in with a sample color of the mortar for Staff to see and a description of the makeup of the mortar, or that the material follows the Maryland Historic Trust Guidelines (MHT uses the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation). Ms. Badart seconded Mr. Hauser’s motion, to include Mr. Bennett’s comments. The motion was approved unanimously.

#09-14 – 3407 Deanwood Drive, Ellicott City

Install pavers; widen driveway.

Applicant: John Russell and Denise Cortis

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. The Applicants propose to install an 18-inch wide border of decorative pavers around a parking pad that provides access to the entrance walkway and to widen the existing driveway near the back corner of the house by 10 feet. The proposed paved border will use ‘Brownstone Red’ Dublin pavers, resembling the brick foundation of the house. The proposed driveway expansion will match the existing macadam surface. The area of the driveway extension is sloping. The Applicant should ensure that the area is regraded properly and any trees removed for the

grading and paving be relocated to maintain the screening they currently provide for the adjacent house.

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

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends Approval.

The Applicant chose to present his request at the May 2009 meeting.

*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

Laurie Scott, Recording Secretary