

Minutes
Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission
July 10, 2014 Meeting

Call to order; introduction of Commission members; pledge of allegiance to the Flag; statement of purposes and operating procedures

Mr. Rob Brennan, Chairperson, opened the regular monthly meeting of the Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) at 6: 00 p.m. The following Commission members were:

<u>Present</u>	<u>Not Present</u>
Mr. Robert P. Brennan, Chairperson	Ms. Faith Nevins Hawks
Ms. Nancy W. Horst, Vice-Chair	
Ms. Carol Allen	
Ms. Rose A. Benton	
Mr. C. Bruce Boswell	
Mr. David J. Bryan	
Mr. Louis Diggs	
Ms. Nancy Hafford	
Mr. Ed Hord	
Mr. Stephen P. Myer	
Mr. Christopher S. Norman	
Mr. Qutub U. K. Syed (arrived at 6:15 p.m.)	
Mr. David S. Thaler	

Attending County staff, Jeff Mayhew (Deputy Director, Department of Planning), Karin Brown (Chief, Preservation Services), Teri Rising (Preservation Services staff), and Vicki Nevy (Secretary to the Commission).

1. **Review of the Agenda**

Ms. Brown noted 2 items were added to the Preliminary Agenda published on June 5, 2014. She reported Agenda Item #4 would be moved back to be discussed with Agenda Item #9.

2. **Approval of the Minutes**

Mr. Brennan asked if anyone proposed changes to the June 12, 2014 Minutes. Hearing none, he called for a motion to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Hord moved to approve the Minutes. Mr. Myer seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

3. **Consent Agenda**

Ms. Brown reported Agenda Item # 6 was the only Consent Agenda item. Mr. Boswell asked why the windows were being replaced. The owner's representative, was not present at that time. Mr. Bryan, a Commission member who lives in the immediate vicinity of the property, stated the windows were cracked and/or broken. Mr. Boswell suggested the property owners be encouraged to replace the existing non-historic storefront windows with a style more appropriate to the original building. Mr. Bryan noted that in his opinion it would be difficult to replicate the type of window original to the building. Ms. Brown added that prior to the current owner; the building was used as a bank, which was responsible for installing the storefront windows. The current owner is within his right to install in-kind windows.

Mr. Brennan called for a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Bryan moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Alteration to properties in County Historic Districts or Landmark structures

4. Loch Raven Elementary; Note: Item 4 was moved back to be discussed prior to item 9 because the proposed school rehabilitation and the proposed construction of the community center are interconnected
5. Ballestone Mansion, 1935 Back River Neck Road, Final Landmarks List #2, National Register of Historic Places (MIHP # BA-0262); in-kind replacement of existing porch handrails and the replacement of existing non-historic wooden porch columns with fiberglass columns of the same style [County Council District #6]

Ms. Brown explained that the County purchased the property in 1969 and at that time no porch existed. The porch was added to the mansion between 1974 and 1976, replicating a porch that once existed there. Because the porch was not original to the house, staff recommended the LPC vote to issue a Notice to Proceed

Mr. Brennan noted the engineer's report provided confirms the porch is not original and that the existing wood columns and railings are in need of

replacement. He also explained the question is whether or not to approve replacing the wood columns with fiberglass columns.

Ms. Brown stated staff researched whether other jurisdictions allowed the use of materials not original to a structure and found that CHAP's Design Guidelines allowed the use of substitute materials "under certain circumstances".

Mr. Myer commented that he thought the wood columns should be replaced with wood columns subject to following a proper maintenance schedule.

Mr. Boswell agreed and explained that replacing the wood columns with fiberglass would require replacement of all the columns so that everything would match and not just the columns that showed decay. Having to replace all the columns would greatly increase the costs.

Mr. Myer moved to vote to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the in-kind replacement of the existing porch handrails and the in-kind replacement of the existing porch columns. Mr. Bryan seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

- **6. "Randallstown Community Center" (Rehoboth International Covenant Church), 9000 Liberty Rd., Randallstown; contributing structure in the Fieldstone County Historic District, Final Landmarks List # 191 (MIHP # BA-2903); in-kind replacement of non-historic storefront windows [County Council District # 4]

Approved via the consent agenda to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

7. Nivens property, 4503 Long Green Road, Glen Arm vicinity; construction of a new house within the boundaries of an existing Historic Environment Setting established for the Wilson Methodist Episcopal Church and Cemetery, 4507 Long Green Road, Final Landmarks List # 351 [County Council District #3]

Ms. Brown explained that this matter concerned a request to construct a new dwelling within the Historic Environmental Setting of the Wilson Methodist Episcopalian Church, a landmarks structure. The applicant's initial proposal was viewed as incompatible by a Technical Committee visiting the site a few months ago. The applicant revised his plans. The new proposal shows a side entry garage and a front porch and the overall design is more compatible with the area's historic character. Staff recommends the Commission vote to issue a Notice to Proceed.

Mr. Brennan thanked the owner for revising his plans. He felt the porch and the dormers were nice elements, however, when viewing the proposed dwelling from the street with the historic church behind it, the garage gable was out of scale with

the house behind it. When studying the plans, he noticed that the arched gable, which is suppose to house the master bath, had a dead space on both sides of the window. He suggested making the gable look more like a dormer. The property owner, Mr. Nivens responded that in his opinion, such a design change could not be done without great additional costs.

Ms. Horst questioned the placement of two windows along the side of the proposed house facing Manor Road. Mr. Hord agreed the window placement needed more thought especially in light of the prominence of the corner the house would be located on.

Ms. Brown suggested creating a Technical Committee to evaluate the revised plans for approval so the homeowner would not have to wait until September for the next LPC meeting.

Mr. Hord noted the plans submitted for consideration at this evening's meeting were a reverse of what is being proposed.

Mr. Boswell agreed the revised plans should show the correct orientation; a changed treatment of the gable over the garage, and a different window arrangement on the side of the house facing Manor Road.

Mr. Hord moved to vote to delegate approval of the revised plans as instructed by the LPC to a Technical Committee. Mr. Boswell seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

8. Herb property, 605 Upland Rd., Pikesville; contributing structure in the Sudbrook Park County Historic District (MIHP 3 BA- 3029); replacement of porch; replacement of slate roof with synthetic slate. [County Council District # 2]

Ms. Brown reported the structure is a large, prominent, contributing structure in dire need of repairs and renovation. The new homeowners are requesting approval for the in-kind replacement of the front porch as well as replacing the existing slate front porch roof with synthetic slate. She indicated the local advisory committee had considered the project and while they prefer to see the porch and roof to be replaced in-kind, they do not want to see the house deteriorate further and therefore are agreeable, albeit reluctantly, with the proposed use of synthetic porch flooring, columns and slate.

Ms. Cheryl Herb, one of the new owners, explained the porch is completely rotted. They have just recently purchased the house and the bank refused to provide further financing unless the porch is replaced promptly. She presented a detail description of the current conditions of the porch and mentioned existing conditions in other parts of the house that they would need to address once the porch is repaired.

The use of alternative materials was discussed by the commissioners at great length. Mr. Hord noted that he had been reading Preservation Briefs which stated that substitute materials can be used in times, provided they meet three conditions: they must be compatible with the historic materials in appearance; have similar physical properties as the historic materials and must be installed to tolerate the different properties of the respective materials. Another Preservation Brief on porches stated, alternative materials can be used – not everywhere, but in certain situations.

Mr. Thaler pointed out the inconsistency of consideration given this request versus the previous item, where the use of substitute materials was denied. Mr. Hord agreed that this matter should be revisited.

The discussion about the use of non-historic materials continued. Mr. Boswell pointed out that the performance of synthetic materials over time varied widely and he was concerned about how they would hold up. Mr. Bryan pointed out that the County has its own historic preservation design guidelines where this very issue has been studied in great detail. The Baltimore County Preservation Guidelines list circumstances under which it may be appropriate to replace a roof with non-historic materials, namely when: The original material is no longer available; the existing material has failed and is likely to fail again; the existing material is not original; the roof is not visible from the front street. Ms. Herb stated that she would be willing to replace the porch flooring, ceiling, columns and railing with wood, as long as she would receive permission to replace the porch's slate roof with synthetic slate. Mr. Hord indicated that because the porch roof was not visible from the street, he would support the use of a synthetic slate for the porch roof.

Mr. Boswell moved to vote to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the in-kind repair/replacement of the existing porch and the replacement of the existing slate porch roof with a synthetic slate product. Mr. Syed seconded the motion, which passed unanimously with the exception of Mr. Bryan voting against the motion.

4. Loch Raven Elementary, 1801 Glen Keith Boulevard, Final Landmarks List #353, (MIHP # BA-3293); request to approve the conceptual plan involving the restoration of the 1947 and part of the 1949 sections, as well as the design of new additions and to approve the demolition of the 1970 and partial demolition of the 1949 sections of the building.[County Council District #5]

Ms. Brown introduced the item explaining the matter concerns a request to adaptively reuse a Final Landmarks List structure. Because of the complexity of the issue, she read the following prepared statement:

The proposal presented this evening, will involve the demolition of certain sections of the building. The school was constructed in three phases; the first

phase was constructed in 1947, the second in 1949 and the third was constructed in 1970. The plan presented to the Commission this evening intends to demolish the 1970 portion and part of the 1949 section of the building. To mitigate the impact of the proposed demolitions, the 1947 and the remaining portion of the 1949 section of the school would be rehabilitated in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards

Approval of the demolitions as proposed, would allow the project to move forward and allow the architects to finalize the plans. Also presented this evening, are drawings for new additions. At this stage, the drawings are conceptual, the final elevations of the new additions as well as a rehabilitation plan would be submitted at the September 11 LPC meeting.

There were two site visits conducted to evaluate the proposal. The first visit was conducted on June 10 of this year and included a representative from the State Maryland Historical Trust. Because the project will involve State funding, 106 review is required. MHT will comment on the proposal independently.

A second site visit conducted on July 2nd, involved a Technical Committee consisting of Landmarks Preservation Commission members; The Technical Committee requested that the architect address the possibility of demolishing only the west portion of the 1949 addition; extending the new building housing the administrative offices, cafeteria and gymnasium in a north-south orientation. This would allow for the preservation of the visually important two story classroom block that faces south along an east-west axis. If there is a need for additional square footage this could be accomplished along the lines of the existing proposal where the new building extends in a north-easterly direction. The proposed northeasterly addition could be a shorter than presently proposed if the existing classrooms in the 1949 south facing block were retained. This would also keep the new building further away from the residential structures on Glen Keith Boulevard.

A second Technical Committee suggestion involves materials and the detailing of the proposed new structures. The two different brick colors proposed are not used in a consistent pattern on the new building. The Technical Committee feels that it would be more appropriate to use the darker color brick for the "infill" areas and the lighter color brick for all the "field" areas. The south elevation at the ground level has too much of a solid feel and more visual relief, be it windows or some other feature, would improve this important facade.

In staff's opinion the Board of Ed has made a successful effort to adaptively reuse the most important sections of this historic building. Staff believes the proposed restoration of the 1947 and part of the 1949 portion of the building mitigates the demolition of the 1970 portion and remaining 1949 portion of the building. Accordingly staff recommends to vote to issue a Notice to Proceed for the demolition of the 1970 portion of the building and the partial demolition of the 1949 portion; and to approve the conceptual design for the new additions with the

understanding that the final design and a restoration plan for the 1947 and 1949 portions of the building would be presented in September.

Ms. Karen Burlingame and Mr. David Strang representing the architectural firm of Grim & Parker, described how the proposal would respect the historic features of the existing structure, while the new additions would improve efficacy consistent with contemporary needs.

Mr. Hord noted he had asked the architects to consider suggestions made by the Technical Committee and if they could not be implemented, to provide adequate justification. He regretted the architects did not provide a reasonable explanation. The architect explained the primary reason for not pursuing the retention of the classroom section of the 1949 addition was grading. Mr. Hord thought the grading issues could be easily addressed. Nevertheless, Mr. Hord felt that overall, the proposal was good and that he could support the project.

Mr. Boswell noted that he was not convinced the classroom block could not be retained as suggested by the Technical Committee. He recommended placing the gymnasium/cafeteria areas to the west of the 1949 block and didn't feel extending that portion of the building another 150 feet would create a problem.

Mr. Jason Gardner, President of the Associates of Loch Raven Village, spoke in support of the proposal to preserve the 1947 structure. He elaborated further that while his group is happy to see portions of the 1949 structure being retained, they ideally would like to see all of the 1949 structure being preserved. The group has no issue with the entire 1970 portion being demolished. He indicated the building serves as an anchor for the community and is part of its identity. Mr. Gardner pointed out there are many interior features which should be preserved as well and agrees with the suggestions made regarding the brick selection. He indicated the group supports the project as long as it is being used as a school.

Mr. Brian Fischer spoke as a representative of the Preservation Alliance of Baltimore County in support of the project subject to the recommendations being proposed by the Technical Committee and subject to the work adhering to the Secretary of the Interior Standards.

(Mr. Diggs left at 7:45)

Mr. Brennan asked those present in the audience who generally approved the proposal to raise their hands.

A resident of the community, Mr. Jed McCormick expressed his opposition to the project. He provided a written statement to staff and the LPC, which described the issues he had with the project. He took issue with the BCPS viability assessment, noting that the school's landmark status has not been given an appropriate score. Lastly, he informed the Commission that 320 friends and

residents of Loch Raven Village had signed a petition requesting the LPC not to approve the proposal.

Mr. Bryan expressed his appreciation for the community's efforts and involvement. He asked Mr. McCormick if he correctly understood that part of the community wanted to keep the structure as a community resource and for it not to be re-activated as a school. Mr. McCormick said that was correct. He and his group do not want to see any changes to the structure and its current use.

Ms. Natalie Russell, also a resident of the community, spoke against the proposed plans and provided a written statement that elaborated on the reasons for her opposition.

Ms. Riborg Norman addressed the LPC explaining she had been the last PTA President before the school was previously closed. She reported the site, as it currently exists, is subject to problems with storm water run-off. She is concerned that doing anything on the site before first addressing site specific problems would be a mistake. She requested the LPC postpone any decision until the controversy surrounding this project is resolved.

Another resident of the community, Mr. Shane Forrey, spoke in favor of maintaining the structure as a community center. He noted the property is not an eye-sore and serves multiple purposes for the community in addition to green space. He worried that all of these benefits would be lost to the community should the structure be re-purposed.

Mr. Hord commented that additions and changes to historic buildings happen all the time. The issue the LPC has to deal with is whether the proposed demolitions and additions are appropriate.

Mr. Norman expressed concerns that different standards are being applied to the Baltimore County Public Schools than are applied to the typical homeowner.

Mr. Bryan pointed out this building was constructed by John K. Ruff and as much of the stone as possible should be incorporated into the new buildings should they be approved.

Mr. Thaler asked for the number of children accommodated by the school before it was closed and the number of children it will accommodate if re-opened and expanded. He felt the placement of the fire lane was a legitimate problem driving the proposal as presented. He acknowledged that some of the larger issues being raised were beyond the purview of the LPC. Mr. Thaler asked about the reason for the urgency moving this project forward. Ms. Brown explained the LPC does not meet in August and that until the architects know what can be demolished they are unable to proceed.

Mr. Thaler moved to vote to establish a Technical Committee to work with the architects to save as much of the 1949 addition as possible, or to come up with a valid reason why not more of the 1949 addition can be saved. Mr. Hord seconded the motion. Mr. Bryan stated that given the complexity of the case, he thinks revised plans should come before the entire Commission, rather than just a Technical Committee. Mr. Boswell noted a Technical Committee has already reviewed the proposal and asked for additional information which has not been provided. In response, Mr. Thaler withdrew the motion. Ms. Brown suggested the Commission could meet in August. After a brief discussion, the LPC agreed to meet in late July or the first two weeks in August.

Mr. Bryan moved to table the issue until a revised plan, addressing the suggestions heard this evening, be presented to a full meeting of the LPC at a date and time yet to be arranged. Ms. Allen seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

9. Loch Raven Community Center, 1801 Glen Keith Boulevard; construction of a community center within the boundaries of the Historic Environmental Setting of the Loch Raven Elementary School. [County Council District # 5]

Ms. Brown explained the request is to construct a community center within the Historic Environmental Setting of the Loch Raven Elementary School. She noted the matter is of great urgency and is presented this evening for LPC approval of the proposed location and design.

Mr. George Klunk, representing Baltimore County Property Management, explained there are multiple groups currently using space in the Loch Raven Elementary School building. All of the groups will need to be housed in other locations once the plans for the new elementary school have been finalized. The proposal is for the construction of a 13,000 square foot, stand alone building at the location shown. The County hopes to have the building constructed before Baltimore County Public Schools begins any demolition of the existing Loch Raven Elementary School.

Mr. Thaler asked how this project can be reviewed in light of the fact that the design of the school has not been finalized. Mr. Brennan stated that in concept he thinks it a great idea to make sure that the services currently provided to the community would continue. He asked Ms. Brown whether the LPC was authorized to review the proposed design. Mr. Hord stated it would be similar to the review of the previous proposal of a new dwelling within a setting.

Ms. Horst asked why this structure would need to be located on this site. Mr. Klunk indicated it was proposed for this particular site at the request of the County Councilman for the district.

Mr. Hord thought the proposed style might be inappropriate for the location.

Mr. Klunk explained these types of structures are tailored for this particular use and if he cannot locate the structure on the site as proposed then he cannot get started with the permit process. Given the time constraints, not getting started immediately would be a problem.

A resident of the community, Ms. Stephanie Darnell, commented that she listened to the discussion regarding the previous project for the construction of a new dwelling within the boundaries of a Historic Environmental. She stated this was the first time the community had heard of such a proposal. She feared the impact a 13,000 square foot building would have on the existing green space and felt homeowners were being held to a different standard than the County.

Mr. Jason Garber of the Associates of Loch Raven Village confirmed general discussions had taken place regarding a community center, however, nothing specific had been discussed. He stated this was the first time a design and location had been shared. He felt this proposal was not consistent with anything currently located within 10 miles of this location. Mr. Garber explained he simply cannot go back to his community and ask them to be agreeable to what was being proposed.

A resident of the community, Mr. Shane Forrey, stated he found this proposal to be another example of two different standards being applied. He was concerned the residents were being misled and was worried what other plans were not being shared with the community.

Mr. Jed McCormick asked if the matter could be postponed in order to allow the community more time to consider the proposal.

Ms. Cheryl Herb thought such a building was necessary because of the many services and activities currently provided in the school. She felt the community center needed a site separate from the school and should not be located outside of the community.

Mr. Brennan asked Mr. Klunk why there was such urgency to moving this project along. Mr. Klunk responded the urgency stemmed from trying to accommodate the Board of Education's schedule and from trying to continue providing the services and space for the activities taking place in the Loch Raven Elementary School. He further explained the buildings are designed to meet the specific functions of a community center and there are several buildings of the same design and size throughout the County. The only aspect that does change is the color and style of the masonry which can be changed to compliment the area it is located in.

Mr. Thaler asked if a site constraint evaluation had been completed regarding the forest buffer. Mr. Klunk said it had not.

Mr. Thaler moved to table consideration of the proposal. Mr. Norman seconded the motion.

As a point of discussion, Mr. Bryan stated the purpose of reviewing structures within the boundaries of a Historic Environmental Setting was to ensure compatibility between the existing structure and proposed structures. He recognized the proposal was for a structure built specifically to house the many activities taking place in the community center and that like buildings exist in other communities, however, he doubts any of those other buildings are located within the boundaries of a Historic Environmental Setting.

Ms. Horst asked Mr. Klunk to give her the locations of some of the other community centers already existing in the County so she could look at them.

Mr. Brennan called for a vote on the motion to table consideration of the proposal. The motion passed unanimously.

Applications for Tax Credit

10. Dudnanski Bungalow, 10000 Philadelphia Road, Final Landmarks List #254 (MIHP # BA-2440); request to:
 - 1) Delineate a Historic Environmental Setting (HES)
 - 2) Repair of existing front porch to include in-kind replacement of existing wooden knee wall cap and wooden columns, replacement of existing plywood decking with Azek PVC tongue and groove decking and replacement of existing wood lattice with PVC lattice [County Council District # 6]

Ms. Brown described the project as proposed and read staff's recommendation for the delineation of the entire tax parcel as the historic environmental setting and to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the repairs and replacements as proposed.

The homeowner, Mr. Dudnanski, described the existing conditions of the porch both currently and at the time the property was landmarked.

Mr. Hord cautioned the homeowner about the span lengths of PVC tongue and groove decking.

Mr. Boswell pointed out that because the existing materials were present at the time the house was landmarked, the LPC could not require him to change the materials he was proposing. However, Mr. Boswell did not feel it would be appropriate to offer a tax credit for using what the LPC would consider inappropriate materials.

After hearing the various recommendations and discussions taking place throughout the evening, Mr. Dudnanski said he would be willing to replace the plywood decking with wood tongue and groove decking and replace the wood lattice in-kind.

Mr. Boswell moved to vote to (1) delineate the entire tax parcel, .25 acres total, (Map 82, Parcel 587) as the historic environmental setting and (b) to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the repair of the existing front porch subject to the in-kind replacement of the existing wooden knee wall cap and wooden columns, replacement of the existing non-historic plywood decking with wood tongue and groove decking and the in-kind replacement of existing wood lattice. Mr. Bryan seconded the motion which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

11. Starkey property, 919 Kingston Road, contributing structure in the Stoneleigh National Historic Register District; basement waterproofing [County Council District #2]

Ms. Brown read staff's recommendation not to vote to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness because in the past the LPC has consistently voted that applicants need to address exterior conditions causing drainage issues before approving waterproofing systems.

Mr. Boswell noted he had visited the property and found it to be sited at a low point. Additionally, he noticed a large sewer drain located in the street right in front of the house. In his opinion, this may be a situation where the proposed waterproofing treatment may be appropriate. Mr. Bryan noted the homeowner indicated in a letter that he had recently had the gutters and spouting serviced in an effort to make sure they were not contributing to the problems he was experiencing.

Ms. Brown stated the applicant had also submitted a tax credit application to the State, the Commission could make approval contingent on the approval by the MHT.

Mr. Bryan moved to vote to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness if the Maryland Historical Trust also approves the waterproofing project. Mr. Thaler seconded the motion which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

12. "Hooper House" (North property), 1100 Copper Hill Rd., contributing structure in the Bare Hills National Register District (MIHP # BA-2353); restoring doors & built-in furniture designed by Marcel Breuer, installation of HVAC systems, interior painting, electrical system upgrade and repairs of exterior walls [County Council District #2]

Ms. Brown introduced the proposal and noted that a Technical Committee consisting of Ms. Allen and Messrs. Brennan, Myer and Boswell had visited the site and they agreed that the restoration of the built-in wood furniture designed by Marcel Breuer would be tax credit eligible. Likewise, the Technical Committee

felt that replacing the asphalt tiles with slate tiles would be tax credit eligible subject to the criteria discussed during the site visit. She read staff's recommendation to vote to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

Mr. Hord moved to vote to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness, subject to the following conditions: (1) The floor tiles should be of a dark color [black or dark gray] and be 1/4 inch thick ; (2) The slate size should match the existing asbestos tiles and should be laid in a grid pattern [not staggered joints]; (3) The steel strip between the existing stone floor and the proposed new stone floor should be maintained at all of the transitions and (4) The first of the new slates should be beveled to meet the elevation of the metal strip.

The homeowners explained they had just very recently discovered correspondence between the original homeowner, the architect and the junior architect for the home which discusses plans for the flooring material and called for the installation of a light colored travertine tile arranged in an offset pattern. The homeowners have located a supply of 3/8 inch thick light colored travertine tile which they would like to use rather than the tile they originally proposed.

Mr. Hord amended his motion to allow the use of the light colored travertine tile instead of the dark color slate. Ms. Horst seconded the motion, which passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Report on County Tax Credit applications approved, or emergency repair approved

The following historic property tax credit application was approved by staff as an emergency repair or due to the receipt of Part II approval for work reviewed by MHT:

Report on County Tax Credit applications approved, or emergency repair approved

The following historic property tax credit application was approved by staff as an emergency repair or due to the receipt of Part II approval for work reviewed by MHT:

King property, 711 Cliveden Road, contributing structure in both the Sudbrook Park County Historic District and the Sudbrook Park National Register Historic District; in-kind roof replacement of carriage house and exterior painting of the house [County Council District # 2]

Kahn/Blanchard property, 605 Murdock Road, contributing structure in the Anneslie National Register Historic District; installation of high velocity central air conditioning [County Council District #5]

Baryza/Schultz property, 607 Murdock Road, contributing structure in the Anneslie National Register Historic District; installation of high velocity central air conditioning system and new circuit breaker [County Council District #5]

Harper property, 5117 S. Rolling Road, contributing structure in the Relay County Historic District (MIHP #BA-2526); in-kind replacement of existing asphalt shingle roof [County Council District #1]

Other Business

Mr. Bryan moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Hord seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously on a voice vote. The meeting adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

VKN:vkn