



FREDERICK COUNTY GOVERNMENT

DIVISION OF PLANNING & PERMITTING

Livable Frederick Planning & Design Office

Jessica Fitzwater
County Executive

Deborah A. Carpenter, AICP, Division Director

Kimberly Gaines, Director

FREDERICK COUNTY HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

STAFF REPORT

September 3, 2025

Address: 6219C Green Valley Rd., Mt. Airy

Meeting Date: Sept. 3, 2025

Applicant: Ballard Jamieson, Jr.

Report Date: August 18, 2025

Case No.: COA 25-03

Staff: Amanda Whitmore

Request: Demolition of Loafing Shed

PROPERTY BACKGROUND

The Still Work farm is a contributing farm in the Peace & Plenty Rural Historic District which was designated to the County Register of Historic Properties (CR # 20-04) on April 4, 2023. The property includes the entire parcel which includes the historic house, wagon/corn crib, springhouse, bank barn, milkhouse, loafing shed, chicken house, garage, and log cabin. The property was built between circa 1758-1920. There have been no previous applications for Certificates of Approvals (COA) filed for this property.



Subject property.

Frederick County: Rich History, Bright Future

30 North Market Street, Frederick, MD 21701 • 301-600-1138 • Fax 301-600-1645

www.FrederickCountyMD.gov

REQUEST

A Certificate of Approval is requested to demolish the loafing shed.



APPLICABLE GUIDELINES

When reviewing alterations to a designated County Register property several documents are to be utilized as guidelines to assist the Commission in developing their decision. These documents include the *Frederick County Historic Preservation Code: Chapter 1-23*, the *Frederick County Peace and Plenty Rural Historic District Design Guidelines (Guidelines)*, and the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation (Standards)*. The pertinent information in these documents is outlined below.

Frederick County Code: Chapter 1-23-7B

- (1) In reviewing applications, the Commission shall give consideration to the historic, archaeological, or architectural significance of the landmark, site, or structure and its relationship to the historic, archeological, or architectural significance of the surrounding area; the relationship of the exterior architectural features of a landmark or structure to the remainder of the landmark or structure and to the surrounding area; the general compatibility of proposed exterior design, scale, proportion, arrangement, texture, and materials to the landmark, site, or structure

and to the surrounding area; and any other factors including aesthetic factors which the Commission deems to be pertinent.

- (2) The Commission shall consider only exterior features of a landmark or structure and shall not consider any interior arrangements.
- (3) The Commission shall not disapprove an application except with respect to the several factors specified in paragraph (1) above.
- (4) The Commission shall be strict in its judgment of plans for sites or structures determined by research to be of historic, archaeological, or architectural significance. The Commission shall be lenient in its judgment of plans for sites or structures of little historic, archaeological, or architectural significance, or of plans involving new construction, unless in the Commission's judgment such plans would seriously impair the historic, archaeological, or architectural significance of surrounding sites or structures. The Commission is not required to limit construction, reconstruction, or alteration to the architectural style of any one (1) period.

Frederick County Peace and Plenty Rural Historic District Design Guidelines

The *Guidelines* contain a Demolition Chapter (Chapter 8) that should be referred to when reviewing this COA application. Further analysis of how this request meets the *Guidelines* is provided in the Evaluation section below.

Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation

The *Standards* define rehabilitation as "the act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features, which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values." The *Standards* that are most applicable to the application before the Commission are as follows:

- 2. The historic character of a property will be retained and preserved. The removal of distinctive materials or alteration of features, spaces, and spatial relationships that characterize a property will be avoided.
- 6. Deteriorated historic features will be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration requires replacement of a distinctive feature, the new feature will match the old in design, color, texture, and, where possible, materials. Replacement of missing features will be substantiated by documentary and physical evidence.

STAFF EVALUATION

The applicant proposes to demolition the loafing shed, a contributing resource, and does not plan to replace the structure.

Staff analysis of this project against the *Guidelines* is as follows:

Guideline	Met?	Comments
8B: Demolition by Neglect	N/A	<p>The <i>Guidelines</i> states that cases of demolition by neglect should follow the process outlined in Section 1-23 of the County Historic Preservation Ordinance.</p> <p>Staff does not find that this is a case of demolition by neglect. The loafing shed was already in a state of significant deterioration when the property was nominated to the County Register.</p>
8C: Alternatives to Demolition	N/A	<p>The <i>Guidelines</i> state the Commission should encourage alternatives to demolition such as repairing historic features or replacing an entire feature with new material when the level of damage precludes repair.</p> <p>The condition of the existing building is in a very deteriorated condition which could result in costly repairs. Additionally, the property is no longer an active farm; therefore, repairing or replacing this building would not have a use and remain vacant.</p>
8G: Required Considerations at Demolition Hearings	N/A	<p>The <i>Guidelines</i> state that a decision regarding demolition must be based on a complete application and in taking action, the Commission consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="845 1315 1318 1410">• If the resource contributes to the designated district and if it is of unusual importance; and <li data-bbox="845 1453 1318 1486">• The proposed replacement plan. <p>Unusual importance is defined in the <i>Guidelines</i> as “a contributing resource that embodies the highest level of architectural, historical, or archaeological significance.”</p> <p>While the building contributes to the overall property, staff finds that it does not have unusual importance. The architecture of these building types is utilitarian, designed simply for its intended use, in this case to house animals temporarily. They are</p>

		common building types found on several farms. According to the Pennsylvania SHPO, loafing sheds, or free stall barns or pen barns, became more recommended by agricultural engineers post-World War II, can be found throughout Pennsylvania and likely few are more than 50 years old. Given Maryland's proximity to Pennsylvania, it's possible these statistics are similar. However, staff could not find information about Maryland.
8H2: Degree of Importance, Contributing Resources	Yes	<p>The <i>Guidelines</i> state that the loss of any contributing component negatively impacts the overall designated historic site and that demolitions will rarely be approved. However, demolitions can be approved if one of the following pertains:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Structure is a deterrent to a major improvement project that benefits the County; • Retention of the structure would not be in the best interest of a majority of persons in the County; or • The resource is an imminent danger to public safety and welfare. <p>Staff finds that the resource is an imminent danger to public safety given its present condition.</p>
8I: Documentation Requirements	N/A	<p>The <i>Guidelines</i> state that if the Commission allows demolition, prior to demolition it must be documented. The extent of documentation will depend on the nature and significance of the resource but will include some combination of the items outlined in this section of the <i>Guidelines</i>.</p> <p>Staff believe that photo documentation and drawings should be sufficient to meet this requirement. Given the structure's condition interior photographic or drawn details may be limited to impossible to obtain.</p>

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Therefore, based on review of the *Guidelines*, Staff finds that the building is not a result of demolition by neglect, that alternatives to demolition are not feasible to this application, that the building is not of unusual importance, and that the building is an imminent danger

to public safety. Therefore, Staff recommends the Commission **conditionally approve** COA #25-03 under the criteria for Application Review in Chapter 1-23-7(B) (1) with the following condition:

- The loafing shed will be documented with photographs and drawings as can be safely obtained to document the construction and features of the building prior to demolition.

With this added condition it can be found that the proposal would be acceptable to allow for demolition of this resource.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION ACTION

Motion to approve with conditions listed in staff report:

Madam Chair, I have studied the application and all other relevant documents and presentations related to this case and I am familiar with the property in question. I move to approve COA # 25-03 for 6219C Green Valley Road with the conditions presented in the staff report.

Motion to approve with conditions modified by Commission:

Madam Chair, I have studied the application and all other relevant documents and presentations related to this case and I am familiar with the property in question. I move to approve COA # 25-03 for 6219C Green Valley Road with the conditions presented in the staff report, with the following modifications:

1. List the conditions that are to be modified, added, or removed.

Motion to deny:

Madam Chair, based on the information presented and the input received during the public hearing, I move that the Commission deny COA #25-03, because evidence has not been presented that demonstrates the proposal complies with the following standards:

1. Identify which standards are not substantially complied with