

IN THE MATTER OF  
THE APPLICATION OF  
KATHY FEENEY

\* BEFORE THE  
\* HOWARD COUNTY

FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL  
TO MAKE EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS  
AT 3783 OLD COLUMBIA PIKE  
ELLICOTT CITY, MARYLAND

\* HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
\* COMMISSION

\* Case No. 22-04b

\* \* \* \* \*

**DECISION AND ORDER**

Pursuant to Title 16, Subtitle 6, of the Howard County Code, notice having been properly published, the Historic Preservation Commission (“Commission”) convened a public hearing on March 3, 2022 to hear and consider the application of Kathy Feeny (“Applicant”), for a Certificate of Approval to make exterior alterations at 3783 Old Columbia Pike, Ellicott City, Maryland (the “Subject Property”). The Commission members present were Erica Zoren, Bruno Reich, Julianne Danna and Ellen Flynn Giles. The following documents, incorporated into the record by reference, are applicable to this case: (1) the appropriate provisions of the Howard County Charter and the Howard County Code, including the Howard County Zoning Regulations; (2) the General Plan for Howard County; (3) the application for a Certificate of Approval and associated records on file with the Commission; (4) the Agenda for the February 3, 2022 and March 3, 2022 Commission meetings; (5) the Ellicott City Historic District Design Guidelines, May, 1998 (the “Design Guidelines” or “Guidelines”); and (6) the general design guidelines listed in Rule 107 of the Commission’s Rules of Procedure.

### **Summary of Testimony**

Ms. Samantha Holmes, Staff to the Commission, presented the application, identifying the work proposed by the Applicant for which approval is requested, and the Staff's recommendation and the basis for the recommendation. Copies of Staff's recommendation and the application were provided to each Commission member and reviewed with the Commission by Ms. Holmes. The Applicant testified in support of the application.

### **Findings of Fact**

Based upon the evidence, the Commission makes the following findings of fact:

#### **A. The Subject Property**

This property is located in the Ellicott City Historic District. According to SDAT, the building on the property dates to 1930.

This application was heard at the February 2022 meeting and the items stated below were continued. The Commission discussed that the proposed side deck did not comply with the Design Guidelines. The Commission requested a detailed landscape plan and elevations showing the proposal, with dimensions.

#### **B. Proposed Improvements**

The Applicant seeks approval to make alterations to the exterior of the building and site. This application was continued from February and has been updated to reflect the items that were continued, which consist of:

- 1) Item 2.C – Front Porch Steps
- 2) Item 3 – New Side Deck
- 3) Item 4 – Walkway

**Item 2.C – Front Porch Steps** – The Applicant proposes to construct new porch steps with Trex decking in the color Toasted Sand, a brown color, with wood pine railings. the photos submitted show a previously existing black metal staircase, which was removed.

**Item 3 – New Side Deck** (referred to in the application as a new side porch) – The application states, “Currently, there is broken concrete which is about 3-4 inches deep on a path to the side door, and no walkway to the main entrance to the house. We would like to cover the concrete with a composite product with pine wood railings.” The Applicant stated via email that the railings will only be along the side and there will be one step down to the retaining wall steps. The posts and rails will be pine wood, painted white to match the style of the front porch railings and will be 36” high with 1-1/2” wood pickets. The deck will be 16” off the ground. The fascia will be composite and painted white.

**Item 4 – Walkway** – Install a paver walkway leading to the front porch and proposed side deck. The pavers would be 18”x18” concrete gray variegated Nantucket Pavers, in the style Traditional Yorkstone. The area currently is turf/soil.

### **C. Staff Report**

#### Front Porch Steps

#### ***Chapter 6.F: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Porches and Balconies***

- 1) *Chapter 6.F states, “Porches are important to a building's sense of scale. Removing, enclosing or altering a porch can dramatically alter the appearance of a building.”*
- 2) *Chapter 6.F recommends:*
  - a. *“Maintain and repair porches and balconies, including flooring, ceilings, railings, columns, ornamentation and roofing, that are original or that reflect the building's historic development.”*
  - b. *“Replace deteriorated features with new materials as similar as possible to the original in material, design and finish.”*
- 3) *Chapter 6.F recommends against, “Adding or replacing porch features using materials not appropriate to the building's style. Materials generally not appropriate for historic porch replacements include unpainted pressure-treated wood, poured concrete and metal (other than the cast iron porches described*

above). *Examples of inappropriate alterations include replacing painted, tongue-and-groove flooring with pressure-treated decking or poured concrete, or replacing wood steps with concrete or brick.*”

On February 3, 2022 the HPC approved the replacement of the existing pressure treated wood porch flooring with a ¾-inch subfloor with a one-piece vinyl finished product on top that would seal any water from penetrating the finished space below. The Trex decking, which is proposed for the steps, is a modern material and would be a different material, color and design from the existing historic porch with replacement pressure treated flooring, a historic tongue and groove wooden porch and the proposed vinyl porch replacement flooring. The Commission needs to determine whether the proposed vinyl and composite materials are appropriate and comply with the Guidelines.

#### New Side Deck

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

1) *Chapter 7.B states:*

- a. *“Porches and decks added to historic buildings should be simple in design and not alter or hide the basic form of the building.”*
- b. *“Proposals to add decks (without walls or roofs) of unpainted, pressure treated wood to the rear of historic buildings are not uncommon. Although these additions are obviously modern, they usually obscure little of the building facade and require little change to historic building features. Decks should not be added to a historic building's primary facade or a facade 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.”*

2) *Chapter 7.B recommends, 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.”*

The proposed side deck will be visible from Old Columbia Pike. The overall design compatibility against the architecture of the house needs to be determined. The application did not contain enough information to gain a full understanding of the deck construction

**Item 2.C – Front Porch Steps** – The Applicant proposes to construct new porch steps with Trex decking in the color Toasted Sand, a brown color, with wood pine railings. the photos submitted show a previously existing black metal staircase, which was removed.

**Item 3 – New Side Deck** (referred to in the application as a new side porch) – The application states, “Currently, there is broken concrete which is about 3-4 inches deep on a path to the side door, and no walkway to the main entrance to the house. We would like to cover the concrete with a composite product with pine wood railings.” The Applicant stated via email that the railings will only be along the side and there will be one step down to the retaining wall steps. The posts and rails will be pine wood, painted white to match the style of the front porch railings and will be 36” high with 1-1/2” wood pickets. The deck will be 16” off the ground. The fascia will be composite and painted white.

**Item 4 – Walkway** – Install a paver walkway leading to the front porch and proposed side deck. The pavers would be 18”x18” concrete gray variegated Nantucket Pavers, in the style Traditional Yorkstone. The area currently is turf/soil.

**C. Staff Report**

Front Porch Steps

***Chapter 6.F: Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings; Porches and Balconies***

- 1) *Chapter 6.F states, “Porches are important to a building's sense of scale. Removing, enclosing or altering a porch can dramatically alter the appearance of a building.”*
- 2) *Chapter 6.F recommends:*
  - a. *“Maintain and repair porches and balconies, including flooring, ceilings, railings, columns, ornamentation and roofing, that are original or that reflect the building's historic development.”*
  - b. *“Replace deteriorated features with new materials as similar as possible to the original in material, design and finish.”*
- 3) *Chapter 6.F recommends against, “Adding or replacing porch features using materials not appropriate to the building's style. Materials generally not appropriate for historic porch replacements include unpainted pressure-treated wood, poured concrete and metal (other than the cast iron porches described*

above). Examples of inappropriate alterations include replacing painted, tongue-and-groove flooring with pressure-treated decking or poured concrete, or replacing wood steps with concrete or brick.”

On February 3, 2022 the HPC approved the replacement of the existing pressure treated wood porch flooring with a ¾-inch subfloor with a one-piece vinyl finished product on top that would seal any water from penetrating the finished space below. The Trex decking, which is proposed for the steps, is a modern material and would be a different material, color and design from the existing historic porch with replacement pressure treated flooring, a historic tongue and groove wooden porch and the proposed vinyl porch replacement flooring. The Commission needs to determine whether the proposed vinyl and composite materials are appropriate and comply with the Guidelines.

#### New Side Deck

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

1) Chapter 7.B states:

- a. *“Porches and decks added to historic buildings should be simple in design and not alter or hide the basic form of the building.”*
- b. *“Proposals to add decks (without walls or roofs) of unpainted, pressure treated wood to the rear of historic buildings are not uncommon. Although these additions are obviously modern, they usually obscure little of the building facade and require little change to historic building features. Decks should not be added to a historic building's primary facade or a facade 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.”*

2) Chapter 7.B recommends, *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.”*

The proposed side deck will be visible from Old Columbia Pike. The overall design compatibility against the architecture of the house needs to be determined. The application did not contain enough information to gain a full understanding of the deck construction

and how it will affect the appearance of the house. Patios are most common on the sides of historic buildings, are built at grade and can better be integrated into the landscape.

3) *Chapter 7.B recommends:*

- c. *“On historic buildings, construct porches of painted wood rather than poured concrete, metal, or unpainted wood. Use stained or unpainted wood only for less visible features of a new porch, such as the decking and step treads, or for simple decks (with railings but no walls or roofs) on the rear of the building in a location not facing or highly visible from a public way.”*
- d. *“Use materials compatible with the existing building for the exposed masonry foundation or piers of a new porch. Poured concrete or concrete block foundations or piers should be given a surface treatment compatible with historic building materials.”*

The proposal to use Trex decking generally complies with the Guidelines. The Guidelines state that unpainted wood may be used for the less visible features of a new deck. While the Trex is not wood and is a plastic product, the flooring will not be a highly visible feature and it is being proposed for a new, non-historic feature. The highly visible items, such as the railings, are proposed to be painted wood.

Walkway

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

1) *Chapter 9.D recommends:*

- a. *“Construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures, particularly for features visible from a public way.”*
- b. *“Construct new terraces or patios visible from a public way from brick, stone or concrete pavers designed to look like indigenous stone.”*

The proposed concrete pavers resemble stone in their size, color and texture and comply with the Guideline recommendations to look like indigenous stone. The pavers are also compatible with the new retaining wall (HPC-22-03), the existing stone retaining wall and as a result, comply with the recommendations to be compatible with the setting and nearby historic structures.

**D. Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends the HPC:

- 1) Determine if the proposed alterations to the front porch steps comply with the Guidelines and approve, deny or modify accordingly.
- 2) Determine if the proposed side deck complies with the Guidelines and approve, deny or modify accordingly.
- 3) Approve the proposed paver walkway.

**E. Testimony**

This application was heard at the February 2022 meeting with certain items being continued to the March 3, 2022 meeting. The full testimony for both meetings is set forth below. The February 3, 2022 testimony includes items decided in Case No. 22-04(a).

**February 3, 2022**

Mr. Shad asked if they had any comments on the application. Ms. Marcy Feeney said the porch flooring also needs to be thought of as a roof because it is the roof to the finished garage area below, which is why they choose to go with a vinyl with a gray look to emulate the roof shingles, because it is a roof. Mr. Reich asked how that would work, if they are relying on the decking to shed the water. Ms. Marcy Feeney said there will be plywood below sloped and the vinyl surface can be walked on and will provide a waterproof seal to the space below. Mr. Reich asked where the Trex was going. Ms. Feeney said the Trex was to be used for the steps and side deck. Ms. Kathy Feeney said they cannot put in the waterproofing material and then a tongue and groove floor as it would raise the porch level above the first floor of the building.

Mr. Reich asked if the rain will just run onto the siding above the garage door. Ms. Marcy Feeney said that was a good question and she hoped not. She said if need be, they

could install a gutter in that area. Mr. Reich thought that was a good solution and hoped it would hold up. Ms. Marcy Feeney said she has used this approach and it has worked before.

Mr. Reich thought the pavers were a good solution. He said the wood siding paint color was appropriate, as were the gutters being changed to half round, and the black color for the gutters will be fine with the black windows.

Ms. Flynn Giles agreed with Mr. Reich and said the application was consistent with the Guidelines. She said the proposed gutter color was consistent with colors already approved. She thought the vinyl membrane was a good solution for the porch.

Ms. Zoren was not inclined to agree about the vinyl porch flooring and recommended looking into a hybrid method to waterproof and seal the space below, but still do a tongue and groove flooring. She said the membrane is 5 mm, and it could be laid under the flooring. Ms. Marcy Feeney said the porch floor is painted gray, so the gray vinyl should not look much different. Ms. Zoren said that material is not appropriate and they have not approved it before front facing a public road.

Regarding the side deck, Ms. Zoren said she did not have enough information to approve a new side deck. She stated she was unclear where it was, how visible it would be, where railings were to be located and what elevation it would be at. She said it would be very visible from Old Columbia Pike. She recommended removing the side deck for approval due to the lack of information.

Ms. Zoren said the walkway and paint were fine. She said the gutter solution made sense as well.

Mr. Shad did not have anything to add to what had already been discussed. He said the vinyl material was a good solution and the railings were fine. He said the off-white

color for the wood siding was fine with black half round gutters. He asked for more information on the side deck, as Ms. Zoren raised good points.

Ms. Marcy Feeney said there is an elevation of the side of the house which shows where the deck will be located in relation to the house and the steps that will lead to the front porch. Ms. Kathy Feeney said there was a cement side patio there and they were trying to cover that and give ability to exit house from the side. Mr. Shad said it is a 10'x 10' deck outside that door. Ms. Kathy Feeney said it was a simple design to match front porch.

Ms. Danna did not find the vinyl appropriate and wanted to see something that blends more. She said it was technically a roof, but it was also a porch and floor and she would prefer a wood textured color. She said the Trex porch steps did not comply with the Guidelines, Chapter 7.B, said that wood would be an appropriate option. Regarding the side porch and walkway, Ms. Danna asked if pavers could be used in place of the deck, since were going to be used to access the deck. She said that blending in the pavers and going up to the retaining wall would be a better look.

Ms. Holmes asked for clarification on the location of the downspouts and gutters. Ms. Marcy Feeney said there was a downspout that comes at an angle and thought the downspout would not be as visible when steps are added back. Ms. Danna asked if the downspout could be moved to the backside of the bay. Ms. Marcy Feeney said there was a stairwell behind the bay so she was not sure that would work.

Mr. Reich asked for clarification on the front porch stair and the use of Trex steps. He said the Trex would not comply with the Guidelines. Ms. Kathy Feeney asked if it would comply if the deck and stairs were pressure treated wood. Mr. Reich said they could

use a pressure treated wood and it could be stained, but not plain pressure treated wood. He said it would need to look historic and they should use a durable wood. He asked why they were building a deck instead of continuing the concrete and adding pavers there. Ms. Kathy Feeney said their contractor said that would be difficult to continue the concrete for a patio. Ms. Danna said they will be digging to install the deck.

Mr. Shad asked if anyone had any other questions for the Applicant before they began deliberation. Ms. Haskins clarified for the Commission that nothing had been amended. Ms. Marcy Feeney said they would be willing to amend everything that was Trex to a pressure treated wood.

Mr. Reich said decks are typically in the rear. Ms. Zoren recalled a case where someone applied for a side deck and the Commission did not approve it and the Applicant went with pavers. The Commission said the side deck was not compatible in this previous case. Mr. Reich said the Commission does not want to see an exposed pressure treated that you would see on the back of a modern house and that a deck would need to be painted or a wood deigned for exterior exposure, a hardwood designed for exposure.

Ms. Danna was not inclined to approve a 10x10 side deck due to the size and visibility and would prefer to see a patio to blend with the pavers proposed and the rear retaining wall. She said the Guidelines recommend that decks should not be added to a primary façade or a façade highly visible from a public way. Mr. Reich agreed that a patio would be preferable. Mr. Reich wanted to know what the owner was willing to do before the Commission deliberated. Ms. Feeney said they are willing to consider wood for the side deck. Ms. Danna referenced the Guidelines stating a deck should not be added to a historic building's primary façade or a façade highly visible from a public way.

Ms. Haskins asked the Applicant to summarize the amendments. Ms. Kathy Feeney said they are amending that they will use wood as opposed to Trex for the porch steps and the deck. Ms. Marcy Feeney said it will either be a pressure treated, Ipe or Brazilian Cherry, that will hold up to the elements.

Mr. Shad asked whether the front porch framing, stringers, joists, etc. was pressure treated. Ms. Marcy Feeney said they are proposing for that to be pressure treated, painted white to match the house.

Mr. Reich said they are lacking a detailed drawing of the steps. Mr. Reich said the front steps would be framed out of treated lumber and then trimmed out with painted wood trim boards, similar to the gables of a house. Mr. Reich said they don't have any detail because there were not drawings provided showing what the construction will look like.

Mr. Shad said they did not enough information on front porch steps and side deck and what it will actually look like, given the visibility. Ms. Zoren said they did not have enough information for the side deck and the guidelines say not to add a visible side deck. She said they need to see the drawings to be able to approve it.

Mr. Shad said the paver walkway is fine, but they do not have any information regarding the size of the walkway. Ms. Danna agreed that she did not understand where the walkway was going. Ms. Feeney said it would be a two-foot walkway up to the deck. Ms. Feeney said the walkway might have steps, but they have not gotten to that level of detail yet.

Mr. Shad said they needed a plan showing this information and detail. Ms. Danna said the plan in the packet is not detailed and she would like to see a detailed site plan. Mr. Reich asked if the Applicant was willing to come back with more detail on the side deck.

The Commission deliberated on the application and determined which items they would continue to the next meeting. They discussed that in this specific scenario and location, the vinyl porch floor would be ok because of its lack of visibility from the street, height above street level. Mr. Reich said that to use wood flooring would require cutting down the front door, and modifying the framing to the porch and garage.

**March 3, 2022:**

Ms. Zoren swore in Ms. Kathy Feeney and Ms. Marcy Feeney. Before the case was discussed, Ms. Zoren asked the Commissioners to confirm if they had enough information to review the case. Ms. Danna, Mr. Reich and Ms. Flynn Giles said they can proceed. The Applicant did not have any corrections to the staff report.

Mr. Reich said the 10'x10' concrete patio and sidewalk all get covered with the bluestone paving. Ms. Kathy Feeney confirmed that was correct. Mr. Reich thanked the Applicant for submitting axonometric and sectional drawings. He said that the treated wood framing will all get covered up with wood trim and asked what the step material would be. Ms. Kathy Feeney said the steps will be framed in pressure treated wood and trimmed out in pine. Mr. Reich said it appeared to comply with the Guidelines.

Ms. Flynn Giles concurred with Mr. Reich. The changes and additional drawings answered the questions and made the application consistent with the Guidelines.

Ms. Danna said it looked much better. She said the stair design was okay as-is. Ms. Danna asked if the whole railing would be white to match the porch. Ms. Feeney said it would be all white.

Ms. Zoren agreed with the other Commissioners. She said the wood steps and patio were more compatible with the Guidelines, as opposed to the application last month.

**F. Motion**

Mr. Reich moved to approve the application as submitted. Ms. Flynn Giles seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**Conclusions of Law**

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Commission concludes as follows:

**A. Standards of Review**

The standards for review of an application for a Certificate of Approval are set forth in Section 16.607 of the Howard County Code and require consideration of:

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

Section 16.607(c) of the Code further provides:

It is the intent of this subtitle that the Commission be strict in its judgment of plans for contributing structures. It is also the intent of this subtitle that the Commission shall be lenient in its judgment of plans for structures of little historic value or plans for new construction, except where such plans would seriously impair the historic or architectural value of surrounding structures or the surrounding area.

Section 16.607(d) authorizes the Commission to adopt guidelines for its review of applications based on the standards set forth in the Code. Pursuant to this authority, the

Commission has adopted the Ellicott City Historic District Design Guidelines. Chapter 6 sets forth the relevant recommendations for Rehabilitation and Maintenance of Existing Buildings in the Historic District, as detailed in the Findings of Fact, part C. Chapter 7 sets forth the relevant recommendations for New Construction: Additions, Porches and Outbuildings in the Historic District, as detailed in the Findings of Fact, part C. Chapter 9 sets forth the relevant recommendations for Landscape and Site Elements in the Historic District, as detailed in the Findings of Fact, part C.

**B. Application of Standards**

Applying these standards and guidelines to the Subject Property, the Commission finds that it contributes to Ellicott City's historic significance. Consequently, in reviewing the application, the Commission will be strict in its judgment. The Commission finds that the Applicant's proposal would not impair the historic or architectural value of the surrounding area. The Commission finds that the proposal is consistent with the Guidelines. The evidence supports this conclusion.

The Applicant seeks approval to make alterations to the exterior of the building and site. This application was continued from February and the items that were continued consist of:

- 4) Item 2.C – Front Porch Steps
- 5) Item 3 – New Side Porch
- 6) Item 4 – Walkway

With respect to the front porch steps, the material proposed to be used was originally Trex, but was amended to be wood steps. The other visible components, the framing and railings, are proposed to be made of wood, painted white and will match the porch. The

front porch steps will be compatible in design and, as such, are consistent with the Guidelines.

A new side deck, also referred to as a new side porch, was proposed. Originally, Trex was proposed. However, the applicant amended the application and proposed to construct the new side porch with 8"x18" concrete gray variegated Nantucket Pavers, in the style Traditional Yorkstone. The proposed pavers resemble stone in their size, color and texture and comply with the Guideline recommendations to look like indigenous stone. The pavers are also compatible with the new retaining wall, which was previously approved. As such, the new side porch complies with the recommendation to be compatible with the setting.

The final item, the walkway, is also to be constructed with the 8"x18" concrete gray variegated Nantucket Pavers, in the style Traditional Yorkstone. As with the new side porch, use of the pavers in is accord with the Guidelines.

For these reasons, and for the reasons identified in the Staff Report and amended in the updated March application, and the reasons stated by the Commission, the Commission concludes that the proposed work will not impair the historic and architectural value of the surrounding area. The application complies with the Guidelines and standards applicable to the Ellicott City Historic District.

**ORDER AND CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL**

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, by a vote of 4 to 0, it is this 7 day of April, 2022, **ORDERED**, that the Applicant's request for a Certificate of Approval to make exterior alterations at the Subject Property, is **APPROVED**.

**HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

Absent  
Allan Shad, Chair BB

Erica Zoren  
Erica Zoren, Vice-Chair BB

Bruno Reich  
Bruno Reich BB

Julianne Danna  
Julianne Danna BB

Ellen Flynn Giles  
Ellen Flynn Giles

Absent  
Dustin Thacker

**APPROVED** for Form and Legal Sufficiency:

HOWARD COUNTY OFFICE OF LAW

Kristen K. Haskins  
Kristen K. Haskins  
Senior Assistant County Solicitor

ANY PERSON AGGRIEVED BY THIS DECISION AND ORDER/CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL MAY APPEAL THE DECISION TO THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR HOWARD COUNTY WITHIN THIRTY DAYS OF THE DATE OF THE DECISION.

IN THE MATTER OF  
THE APPLICATION OF  
GEORGE TOLEN

\* BEFORE THE  
\* HOWARD COUNTY  
\* HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
\* COMMISSION  
\* Case Nos. 22-08 and 22-09

FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL  
TO MAKE EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS  
AT 3725 PARK AVENUE  
ELLCOTT CITY, MARYLAND

\* \* \* \* \*

**DECISION AND ORDER**

Pursuant to Title 16, Subtitle 6, of the Howard County Code, notice having been properly published, the Historic Preservation Commission (“Commission”) convened a public hearing on March 3, 2022 to hear and consider the application of George Tolen (“Applicant”), for a Certificate of Approval to make exterior alterations at 3725 Park Avenue, Ellicott City, Maryland (the “Subject Property”). The Commission members present were Erica Zoren, Bruno Reich, Julianne Danna, and Ellen Flynn Giles. The following documents, incorporated into the record by reference, are applicable to this case: (1) the appropriate provisions of the Howard County Charter and the Howard County Code, including the Howard County Zoning Regulations; (2) the General Plan for Howard County; (3) the application for a Certificate of Approval and associated records on file with the Commission; (4) the Agenda for the March 3, 2022 Commission meeting; (5) the Ellicott City Historic District Design Guidelines, May, 1998 (the “Design Guidelines” or “Guidelines”); and (6) the general design guidelines listed in Rule 107 of the Commission’s Rules of Procedure.

### **Summary of Testimony**

Ms. Samantha Holmes, Staff to the Commission, presented the application, identifying the work proposed by the Applicant for which approval is requested, and the Staff's recommendation and the basis for the recommendation. Copies of Staff's recommendation and the application were provided to each Commission member and reviewed with the Commission by Ms. Holmes. The Applicant testified in support of the application.

### **Findings of Fact**

Based upon the evidence, the Commission makes the following findings of fact:

#### **A. The Subject Property**

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

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

In November 2021, the Applicant was approved to install a sign for the Children's Museum in case MA-21-38a.

#### **B. Proposed Improvements**

The Applicant proposes to install two signs, which were assigned separate case numbers but have been consolidated in this Decision and Order as the signs were addressed together during the hearing. The assigned case numbers are as follows:

1. HPC-22-08 – Garden Sponsorship Sign
2. HPC-22-09 – Porch Memorial Sign

HPC-22-08 – Garden Sponsorship Sign

The sign will be located in the front yard on the Park Avenue side of the building (which faces the Court house). The sign will be 8 inches by 10 inches (for a total of 0.55 square feet) and ground mounted at a 45-degree angle. The sign will be an aluminum sign. The top of the sign will be located 16 inches above ground level. The ground mount post will be ¾-inch steel tubing, painted black. The sign will match the design and color scheme of the main Children’s Museum sign approved in MA-21-38a. The center background will be off-white, the perimeter background will be Harvest Gold, the main lettering and pinstriping will be blue and the minor lettering and pinstriping will be red.

The garden sponsorship sign will consist of four lines and read:

THE GARDEN

Sponsors:

The John Slack Family & Slack Funeral Home, P.A.

2020

**C. Staff Report**

***Chapter 11.A: Signs: General Guidelines***

- 1) *Chapter 11.A states, “Signs in the district should reflect this heritage and also be scaled to the pedestrian. Because the signs will be close to viewers, quality and detail are more effective than overwhelming size.”*
- 2) *Chapter 11.A recommends:*
  - a. *“Use simple, legible words and graphics.”*

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

The application complies with these Guidelines and will match the coloring and design of a previously approved sign.

3) *Chapter 11.A recommends:*

- a. *“Keep letters to a minimum and the message brief and to the point. In many cases, symbols or illustrations that communicate the nature of the business can be used.”*
- b. *“Use historically appropriate materials such as wood or iron for signs and supporting hardware. Select hardware that blends with the style of the sign and is neither flimsy nor excessively bulky.”*

The Commission should determine if the sign complies with these Guidelines.

While the text contains more verbiage than typical, it is not a business sign and is part of the museum signage. Likewise, while the sign is not wood or HDU to resemble wood, the aluminum material is appropriate for the angled freestanding sign and will not be overly bulky. The porch sign, also proposed to be aluminum, will sit flush against the fascia and not unnecessarily protrude due to the slim depth of the aluminum.

***Chapter 11.B.2: Signs: Flat-Mounted Signs***

- 4) *In most cases, limit the area of signage to one-half square foot of sign area for each linear foot of primary street frontage, with a limit of eight square feet in area for any one sign. More sign area is appropriate for some of Ellicott City's larger buildings. where these limits would result in signs that are ineffective*

***Chapter 11.B.5: Signs: Freestanding***

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

The porch sign will be 0.34 square feet and the garden sign 0.55 square feet. Each sign is well under the recommended size for its type.

***Chapter 11.B: Signs: Commercial Buildings***

- 6) *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.”*
- 7) *Chapter 11.B recommends against:*

- a. *“Two signs where one is sufficient to provide an easily visible identification of the business.”*
- b. *“More than two signs per business per façade.”*

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

- 8) *Chapter 11.D recommends, “Design signs of a particular type (e.g., all street name signs or all signs directing visitors to parking areas or public buildings) with a consistent style, lettering, size, color and logo.”*

The Commission rarely reviews requests for memorial and non-commercial signage. In 2012 the Commission approved the “Blue Star Memorial, A Tribute to the Armed Forces of America” (HDC-12-25) to be located within a front garden area at the Visitor’s Center/8267 Main Street. The Guidelines do not currently address memorial signs and other types of non-commercial signs and primarily focus on business signs, traffic signs and other types of public signage.

The Commission should determine if these signs should be evaluated under Chapter 11.B and 11.D and whether those Guidelines are applicable to the current request. Under these chapters, the Guidelines do address multiple signs on a building and recommend no more two sign per business per façade or no more than two signs when one is sufficient to identify the business. The Guidelines also provide recommendations for a coordinated sign program. In this case, the proposed signs are well below the recommended sign area and are at or less than 0.55 square feet. The signs are coordinated with the primary sign identifying the museum and match the sign in shape, design and color. While there will be two signs at the front of the building, the garden sign does not identify the museum and will be located close to the ground, within a future garden space, whereas the primary sign sits close to the street on posts.

**D. Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends the HPC determine if the signs comply with the Guidelines and approve, deny or modify accordingly.

**E. Testimony**

Ms. Flynn Giles recused herself. Ms. Zoren swore in George Tolen. Mr. Tolen did not have any additions or corrections to the staff report. Ms. Danna asked if the Garden sponsorship sign would be changed out with new sponsors each year. Mr. Tolen said the sign was permanent and would not be changed out. Ms. Danna did not have any questions on the other sign.

Mr. Reich said he has known Mr. Tolen for several decades, but did not find he would be impaired in his decision making. Mr. Reich questioned the location of the proposed signs and Mr. Tolen explained the building has two fronts as it was sandwiched between the streets. Mr. Tolen said the signs have the same design. Mr. Reich said the signs were fine, very minimal and he saw them more as historical markers rather than retail signs on Main Street. He did not find a problem having two on the Park Avenue elevation. He said the colors were subdued and minimal and complied with the Guidelines.

Ms. Zoren agreed the signs complied with the Guidelines, the size was appropriately scaled and the way they tie into the main signage for the building created a campus feel.

**F. Motion**

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

**Conclusions of Law**

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Commission concludes as follows:

**A. Standards of Review**

The standards for review of an application for a Certificate of Approval are set forth in Section 16.607 of the Howard County Code and require consideration of:

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

Section 16.607(c) of the Code further provides:

It is the intent of this subtitle that the Commission be strict in its judgment of plans for contributing structures. It is also the intent of this subtitle that the Commission shall be lenient in its judgment of plans for structures of little historic value or plans for new construction, except where such plans would seriously impair the historic or architectural value of surrounding structures or the surrounding area.

Section 16.607(d) authorizes the Commission to adopt guidelines for its review of applications based on the standards set forth in the Code. Pursuant to this authority, the Commission has adopted the Ellicott City Historic District Design Guidelines. Chapter 11 sets forth the relevant recommendations for Signs: General Guidelines in the Historic District, as detailed in the Findings of Fact, part C.

**B. Application of Standards**

Applying these standards and guidelines to the Subject Property, the Commission finds that it contributes to Ellicott City's historic significance. Consequently, in reviewing the application, the Commission will be strict in its judgment. The Commission finds that the Applicant's proposal would not impair the historic or architectural value of the surrounding area. The Commission finds that the proposal is consistent with the Guidelines. The evidence supports this conclusion.

The Applicant seeks approval to install two signs, a Garden Sponsorship Sign and a Porch Memorial Sign.

The Garden Sponsorship Sign is proposed to be installed in the front yard on the Park Avenue side of the building (which faces the Courthouse). The sign will be 8 inches by 10 inches (for a total of 0.55 square feet) and ground mounted at a 45-degree angle. The sign will be an aluminum sign. The top of the sign will be located 16 inches above ground level. The ground mount post will be ¾-inch steel tubing, painted black. The sign will match the design and color scheme of the main Children's Museum sign approved in MA-21-38a. The center background will be off-white, the perimeter background will be Harvest Gold, the main lettering and pinstriping will be blue and the minor lettering and pinstriping will be red.

The second sign, the Porch Memorial Sign, is proposed to be installed on the Court Avenue side of the building and will be mounted on the lattice below the cast iron porch. The sign will be 5 inches by 10 inches, for a total of 0.34 square feet. The sign will be an aluminum sign. The sign will match the design and color scheme of the main Children's Museum sign approved in MA-21-38a and the Garden Sponsorship sign as the center background will be off-white, the perimeter background will be Harvest Gold, the main lettering and pinstriping will be blue and red.

While the Guidelines address signs, they do not specifically address memorial and non-commercial signs which are distinguishable. That being said, the Guidelines have recommendations for a coordinated sign program. Both signs proposed match the previously approved sign which identifies the museum. The Guidelines also provide recommendations on design with which these signs comply. These signs use minimal

colors and appropriately scaled. The proposed signs are well below the recommended size for its respective sign type. As such, the signs comply with the recommendations set forth in the Guidelines.

For these reasons, and for the reasons identified in the Staff Report, and the reasons stated by the Commission, the Commission concludes that the proposed work will not impair the historic and architectural value of the surrounding area. The application complies with the Guidelines and standards applicable to the Ellicott City Historic District.

**ORDER AND CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL**

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, by a vote of 6 to 0, it is this 7 day of April, 2022, **ORDERED**, that the Applicant's request for a Certificate of Approval to make exterior alterations at the Subject Property, is **APPROVED**.

**HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

Absent

Allan Shad, Chair

Erica Zoren BB

Erica Zoren, Vice-Chair

Bruno Reich BB

Bruno Reich BB

Julianne Danna

Julianne Danna

Recused

Ellen Flynn Giles

Absent

Dustin Thacker

**APPROVED** for Form and Legal Sufficiency:

HOWARD COUNTY OFFICE OF LAW

Kristen K. Haskins

Kristen K. Haskins  
Senior Assistant County Solicitor

ANY PERSON AGGRIEVED BY THIS DECISION AND ORDER/CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL MAY APPEAL THE DECISION TO THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR HOWARD COUNTY WITHIN THIRTY DAYS OF THE DATE OF THE DECISION.

IN THE MATTER OF	*	BEFORE THE
THE APPLICATION OF	*	HOWARD COUNTY
GEORGE TOLEN	*	HISTORIC PRESERVATION
FOR A CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL	*	COMMISSION
TO MAKE EXTERIOR ALTERATIONS	*	Case No. 22-10
AT 8328 COURT AVENUE AND 3725	*	
PARK AVENUE, ELLICOTT CITY,	*	
MARYLAND	*	
* * * * *		

**DECISION AND ORDER**

Pursuant to Title 16, Subtitle 6, of the Howard County Code, notice having been properly published, the Historic Preservation Commission (“Commission”) convened a public hearing on March 3, 2022 to hear and consider the application of George Tolen (“Applicant”), for a Certificate of Approval to make exterior alterations at 8328 Court Avenue and 3725 Park Avenue, Ellicott City, Maryland (the “Subject Property”). The Commission members present were Erica Zoren, Bruno Reich, Julianne Danna and Ellen Flynn Giles. The following documents, incorporated into the record by reference, are applicable to this case: (1) the appropriate provisions of the Howard County Charter and the Howard County Code, including the Howard County Zoning Regulations; (2) the General Plan for Howard County; (3) the application for a Certificate of Approval and associated records on file with the Commission; (4) the Agenda for the March 3, 2022 Commission meeting; (5) the Ellicott City Historic District Design Guidelines, May, 1998 (the “Design Guidelines” or “Guidelines”); and (6) the general design guidelines listed in Rule 107 of the Commission’s Rules of Procedure.

### Summary of Testimony

Ms. Samantha Holmes, Staff to the Commission, presented the application, identifying the work proposed by the Applicant for which approval is requested, and the Staff's recommendation and the basis for the recommendation. Copies of Staff's recommendation and the application were provided to each Commission member and reviewed with the Commission by Ms. Holmes. The Applicant testified in support of the application.

### Findings of Fact

Based upon the evidence, the Commission makes the following findings of fact:

#### **A. The Subject Property**

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

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

In November 2021, the Applicant was approved to install a sign for the Children's Museum in case MA-21-38a. Cases HPC-22-08 and HPC-22-09 also included signs for the future opening of the Children's Museum.

The previous approvals referenced above all correspond to the work the Historical Society is undertaking in preparation to open the Children's Museum (corresponding with the EC250 Celebration). The following scope of work is a continuation of the work being done for the Children's Museum opening.

**B. Proposed Improvements**

The Applicant seeks approval for the following work:

1) **Item 1**- The site previously contained concrete steps in disrepair and a large decaying tree stump. The Applicant removed these items, smoothed out the soil and laid down a bed of mulch across the hillside. As these were site alterations, retroactive approval is needed for this action.

2) **Item 2** - Installation of approximately 18 irregular shaped 3-foot flagstone pavers. The steps will lead from the base of the Park Avenue steps at 3725 Park Avenue to the top of the steps at Court Avenue, with a turn between the buildings to access at door at 8328 Court Avenue (the Historical Society Museum building).

3) **Item 3** – This item has been updated from original application - Installation of a 16-foot by 14-foot patio along the side of 3725 Park Drive on the Court Avenue side of the building. The patio will be constructed with 23 ½" by 23 ½" Bluestone (#M2374) Hanover Slateface Prest paver (a concrete product), in the #13 finish. The patio will be edged in the 4x8x2 3/8" Prest Brick Pavers in the charcoal/natural finish (a concrete product). These edge pavers will be engraved as part of a fundraising effort for the museum.

4) **Item 4** - Installation of a stacked stone retaining wall at the Court Avenue side of the building, using existing stone from the property to hold the hillside back from erosion.

5) **Item 5** – Installation of an iron fence along the Court Avenue side of the property, due to the steep slope. The fence will consist of simple square pickets with 4-inch spacing. The fence will be a maximum height of 5 feet to the top of the round finials/post caps, otherwise the pickets will be 3 feet above grade. See Figure 23.

The manufacturer’s information for the pavers provides the following information on the pavers: “The SlateFace Paver has been designed to reproduce the texture, color and appearance of natural slate. Stocked in Hanover’s BlueStone and Tennessee Flagstone colors, its irregular top surface was developed from actual sections of stone.”

The manufacturer’s information provides the following information on the #13 finish:

“Hanover Pavers are also produced in a Tudor #13 finish which gives a delicate sandstone texture.”

### **C. Staff Report**

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

*Chapter 9.D recommends:*

- 1) *“Construct new site features using materials compatible with the setting and with nearby historic structures, particularly for features visible from a public way.”*
- 2) *“Construct new terraces or patios visible from a public way from brick, stone or concrete pavers designed to look like indigenous stone.”*
- 3) *“Install open fencing, generally not more than five feet high, of wood or dark metal. Use closed wood fences only for side and rear yards in areas where a precedent exists. Construct closed wood fences of painted vertical boards, with straight or angled rather than scalloped tops.”*

The Applicant originally proposed to use the Prest Brick concrete pavers, in the color Natural/Charcoal blend. When used next to a historic granite building, these pavers tend to look more like the concrete product they are, rather than a stone/brick product they are trying to emulate. The Applicant updated the proposal to include a concrete bluestone paver patio edged in the concrete paver, to unite the proposed flagstone pathway and proposed patio. The proposal complies with the Guideline recommendations.

The proposed stone retaining wall will utilize stone on-site and complies with the above Guideline recommendations.

The proposed black iron fence complies with the Guideline recommendations and will be compatible with the iron fence on the existing historic structure.

**D. Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends the HPC:

- 1) Retroactively approve Item 1, the site alterations.
- 2) Approve Item 2.
- 3) Approve Item 3.
- 4) Approve Item 4, contingent that the wall is dry stacked and utilizes the stone on-site.
- 5) Approve Item 5.

**E. Testimony**

Ms. Flynn Giles recused herself. Mr. Tolen was sworn in. Mr. Reich asked why they would not use real brick and bluestone pavers. Mr. Tolen said the brick cannot withstand the freeze cycle. Mr. Reich asked if he was saying the concrete pavers will withstand better than regular brick. Mr. Tolen said that was correct. Mr. Reich asked staff

for advice on the Guideline recommendations for the concrete product. Ms. Holmes referenced Chapter 9.D where the Guideline recommend using brick, stone or concrete pavers designed to looked like indigenous stone.

Ms. Danna asked if the tone of the stairs will match the other materials they are requesting to use. Mr. Tolen said it will match the color of the steps from Park Avenue. Mr. Tolen said they were sandwiched between two stone buildings and were trying to play off of those colors. Ms. Danna suggested leaving the edging off of the patio. Mr. Tolen said the bricks were going to be the fundraiser to pay for the patio. Ms. Danna asked how the engraving would look. Mr. Tolen said it would be laser or sandblasted in. Ms. Danna asked if the brick will match the steps. Mr. Tolen corrected that the bluestone pavers will match the steps.

Mr. Tolen noted the huge topography change between the two streets and explained that the area was not readily visible.

Ms. Danna asked where the stones are coming from and whether it was an old foundation. Mr. Tolen said it was an old retaining wall that ran parallel to Park Avenue. He did not know how long the stone have been on-site. Mr. Tolen said they would be using the stones to step back the wall and it would only be a few rows. Ms. Danna was hesitant to approve the removal of stones without knowing what the features was that they were removing. Mr. Tolen said they were not going to remove the whole row. Ms. Danna said it could be an archeological feature. Mr. Tolen suspected the feature was installed when the addition to the court house was built as the whole grade changed then.

Ms. Zoren agreed with the previous comments. She found the pavers mimic the look of stone and were of an appropriate scale and texture to mimic that stone. She was

leaning toward Ms. Danna's comments about pulling the stone retaining wall out of the application. Mr. Tolen said that was fine to remove. Ms. Holmes asked Mr. Tolen if he would like to withdraw the wall from the application and he said yes. Ms. Burgess clarified the Commissioners were not objecting to the use of the proposed wall, but the possible destruction of a historic wall. Ms. Burgess suggested it come back through Minor Alterations.

**F. Motion**

Ms. Danna moved to approve Items 1, 2, 3 and 5 of the application. Mr. Reich seconded. The motion was unanimously approved.

**Conclusions of Law**

Based upon the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Commission concludes as follows:

**A. Standards of Review**

The standards for review of an application for a Certificate of Approval are set forth in Section 16.607 of the Howard County Code and require consideration of:

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

Section 16.607(c) of the Code further provides:

It is the intent of this subtitle that the Commission be strict in its judgment of plans for contributing structures. It is also the intent of this subtitle that the Commission shall be lenient in its judgment of plans for structures of little historic value or plans for new construction, except where such plans would seriously impair the historic or architectural value of surrounding structures or the surrounding area.

Section 16.607(d) authorizes the Commission to adopt guidelines for its review of applications based on the standards set forth in the Code. Pursuant to this authority, the Commission has adopted the Ellicott City Historic District Design Guidelines. Chapter 9 sets forth the relevant recommendations for Landscape and Site Elements in the Historic District, as detailed in the Findings of Fact, part C.

**B. Application of Standards**

Applying these standards and guidelines to the Subject Property, the Commission finds that it contributes to Ellicott City's historic significance. Consequently, in reviewing the application, the Commission will be strict in its judgment. The Commission finds that the Applicant's proposal would not impair the historic or architectural value of the surrounding area. The Commission finds that the proposal is consistent with the Guidelines. The evidence supports this conclusion.

The Applicant seeks approval for the following work:

**Item 1-** The site previously contained concrete steps in disrepair and a large decaying tree stump. The Applicant removed these items, smoothed out the soil and laid down a bed of mulch across the hillside. As these were site alterations, retroactive approval is needed for this action.

**Item 2** - Installation of approximately 18 irregular shaped 3-foot flagstone pavers. The steps will lead from the base of the Park Avenue steps at 3725 Park Avenue to the top of the steps at Court Avenue, with a turn between the buildings to access at door at 8328 Court Avenue (the Historical Society Museum building).

**Item 3** – This item has been updated from original application - Installation of a 16-foot by 14-foot patio along the side of 3725 Park Drive on the Court Avenue side of the building. The patio will be constructed with 23 ½” by 23 ½” Bluestone (#M2374) Hanover

Slateface Prest paver (a concrete product), in the #13 finish. The patio will be edged in the 4x8x2 3/8" Prest Brick Pavers in the charcoal/natural finish (a concrete product). These edge pavers will be engraved as part of a fundraising effort for the museum.

**Item 4** – Withdrawn on the record.

**Item 5** – Installation of an iron fence along the Court Avenue side of the property, due to the steep slope. The fence will consist of simple square pickets with 4-inch spacing. The fence will be a maximum height of 5 feet to the top of the round finials/post caps, otherwise the pickets will be 3 feet above grade.

With respect to the first item, retroactive approval was requested for removal of concrete stairs and a large tree stump as well as smoothing out the soil and putting down a bed of mulch across the hillside. The concrete stairs were in disrepair and the large tree stump was decaying. Removal is consistent with the Guidelines and is further supported by the approval of the additional items proposed in the application and set forth herein.

The Guidelines recommend that new features, such as the walkway and patio proposed to installed, should be constructed using compatible materials. The proposed walkway will be constructed with flagstone pavers. The pavers, which are more durable, are designed to mimic the look of stone. As such, the proposed pavers comply with the Guidelines recommendation to use concrete pavers designed to look like indigenous stone. Similarly, the patio will be constructed with concrete bluestone pavers which are designed to emulate natural slate. The patio will be edged with a concrete brick paver to unite the proposed flagstone pathway and proposed patio. The brick pavers will be engraved as part of a fundraiser for the museum. The engraving will be laser or sandblasted in. In addition

to being constructed with materials designed to look like indigenous stone, the patio is an appropriate scale for its setting and is in accord with the Guidelines.

The final item proposed is the installation of a black iron fence along the Court Avenue side of the property. The fence will consist of simple square pickets with 4-inch spacing. The fence will be a maximum height of 5 feet to the top of the round finials/post caps, otherwise the pickets will be 3 feet above grade. The proposed black iron fence complies with the Guideline recommendations for color, design and height. Further, it will be compatible with the iron fence on the existing historic structure.

For these reasons, and for the reasons identified in the Staff Report, and the reasons stated by the Commission, the Commission concludes that the proposed work will not impair the historic and architectural value of the surrounding area. The application complies with the Guidelines and standards applicable to the Ellicott City Historic District.

**ORDER AND CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL**

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, by a vote of 6 to 0, it is this 7 day of April, 2022, **ORDERED**, that the Applicant's request for a Certificate of Approval to make exterior alterations at the Subject Property, is **APPROVED**, as amended and detailed herein.

**HOWARD COUNTY HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION COMMISSION**

Absent

Allan Shad, Chair

Erica Zoren BB

Erica Zoren, Vice-Chair

Bruno Reich BB

Bruno Reich SP

Julianne Danna

Julianne Danna

Recused

Ellen Flynn Giles

Absent

Dustin Thacker

**APPROVED** for Form and Legal Sufficiency:

HOWARD COUNTY OFFICE OF LAW

Kristen K. Haskins

Kristen K. Haskins  
Senior Assistant County Solicitor

ANY PERSON AGGRIEVED BY THIS DECISION AND ORDER/CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL MAY APPEAL THE DECISION TO THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR HOWARD COUNTY WITHIN THIRTY DAYS OF THE DATE OF THE DECISION.