Minutes
Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission
January 10, 2019 Meeting

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

Mr. Rob Brennan, Chairperson, opened the regular monthly meeting of the Baltimore County Landmarks Preservation Commission (LPC) at 6:01 p.m. The following Commission members were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert P. Brennan, Chair</td>
<td>Ms. Carol Allen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. C. Bruce Boswell</td>
<td>Ms. Rose A. Benton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Louis Diggs</td>
<td>Ms. Faith Nevins Hawks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Ed Hord</td>
<td>Mr. Qutub U. K. Syed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Nancy W. Horst, Vice-Chair</td>
<td>Mr. Richard Yaffe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mitch Kellman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Wendy McIver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Stephen P. Myer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. David S. Thaler</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attending County staff, Teri Rising (Preservation Services staff), Kaylee Justice (staff) and Jeff Mayhew (Acting Director).

1. **Selection of Chair & Vice-Chair**

With January being the month that the Chair and Vice-Chair positions were up for consideration, Mr. Brennan indicated that both he and Ms. Horst were respectfully requesting to continue in their positions and seeking affirmation from the Commission members.

Mr. Thaler moved that Rob Brennan continue for another term as Chair and Nancy Horst for another term as Vice-Chair. Mr. Boswell seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer and Mr. Thaler. Mr. Brennan recused himself.

Mr. Thaler indicated that he wished to express, on behalf of himself and the other Commission members, the wonderful job the Chair and Vice-Chair have done in their roles, especially in light of the difficult and emotional circumstances that are often brought before them. He added that they have both done an exemplary job.
2. **Review of the Agenda**

Ms. Rising reported there were no changes to the Preliminary Agenda published January 3, 2019.

3. **Approval of the Minutes**

Mr. Brennan asked if anyone proposed changes to the November 8, 2018 Minutes. Hearing none, Mr. Brennan called for a motion to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Hord moved to approve the Minutes as drafted. Mr. Myer seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.

4. **Consent Agenda**

Ms. Rising read the Action Recommendations for Consent Agenda Items 6, 7, 10 and 12.

Mr. Brennan called for a motion. Mr. Thaler moved to approve the Consent Agenda items as presented. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.

5. **Items for Discussion and Vote**

“Choate House” and setting, 9600 Liberty Road, Randallstown [County Council District # 4] National Register of Historic Places (Listed July 20, 1989) MIHP # BA-0015; Public Hearing on Nomination to the Preliminary Landmarks List

Mr. Thaler noted his intent to recuse himself on this matter as a point of personal privilege, but stated he planned to remain in the hearing room during the discussion.

Ms. Rising presented the historic background information on the property, including past efforts from the Landmarks Preservation Commission to designate the site. She explained that the primary elements of the property’s history had been thoroughly explored and documented as part of those various surveys and wished to focus primarily on the new information she uncovered during her research along with the physical changes that had occurred since the building was previously surveyed. Ms. Rising outlined the historic significance of the property and added that the former tavern was one of the earliest surviving buildings in the Randallstown area of Baltimore County and retained excellent integrity in overall form in spite of the architectural changes that had been applied to the building.

Following the introduction of the Choate House, Ms. Rising gave a PowerPoint presentation that provided additional contextual details about the history of the property as well as photographs that captured the various architectural changes that had occurred. She
highlighted a historic plat recently discovered during a trip to the Maryland State Archives as part of her survey process.

Mr. Brennan recognized former Commission member John W. Hill who wished to speak in favor of the nomination. Mr. Hill described his observations of the building during a recent visit to the site including the condition and beauty of the building’s stone. He especially noted the stone’s greenish tint due to chromium or other minerals.

Mr. Boswell asked that a close up photograph of the exterior stone as described by Mr. Hill be displayed for review. Ms. Rising added that the rear walls were still partially visible in spite of the addition. Several members made remarks on the stone’s origins and offered additional observations on the visible patterns and coursing during the continued discussion with Mr. Hill.

Mr. Diggs remembered visiting the site about 10 years before when it had been a church. Ms. Rising suggested the visit may have taken place in conjunction with former staff member Karin Brown, who had been working with the owner on resolving maintenance issues. Mr. Diggs recalled some issues with the porch but believed little had changed on the inside in spite of it being used as a church. Ms. Rising added that she thought staff had been involved previously in an effort to help identify funding to aid with rehabilitation, but lost contact with the owner for unknown reasons. She also mentioned that the building had been part of foreclosure proceedings and was now owned by a bank in Florida.

Mr. Boswell mentioned that another item of interest was the historical connection between the name of the first tavern owner, Israel Owings, and the extended Owings Mills Boulevard that had been extended so it was now contiguous to the property.

Mr. Brennan recognized Mr. Tim Bishop, speaking as the Board Chairman on behalf of the Preservation Alliance of Baltimore County, the third party responsible for having submitted the application. Mr. Bishop identified previous speaker Mr. John W. Hill as one of their Board of Directors. He expressed the organization’s support of the nomination and offered some additional comments involving the structure’s architectural evolution over time and noted certain elements that reflected eras not previously identified in the survey documentation on file with the National Park Service.

Mr. Diggs moved to vote to place the “Choate House” & setting (excluding the 1990 addition), on the Preliminary Landmarks List under criteria (1) – for its association with the transportation history of Baltimore County, in particular its association with the Baltimore and Liberty Turnpike, which helped influence the development and expansion of agricultural and mining industries in the Randallstown area of Baltimore County and beyond; for its association with the Choate family, who were significant for their involvement with the development of the Randallstown area and for their involvement with the Tyson chromite mining operation at Soldiers Delight. (2) – As an important, and one of the few surviving, examples of rural 19th and early 20th century domestic architecture that, in spite of its loss of some Italianate elements, has maintained its overall historic integrity through its retention of setting, physical materials,
design features and aspects of construction. (3) – As an excellent representative example of early 19th century local granite stone construction (b) to delineate the entire parcel, 2.18 acres total, (Tax Map 76, Parcel # 128, Tax ID # 0203230070), as its historic environmental setting. Mr. Boswell seconded the motion, which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, and Mr. Myer. There were no dissenting votes. Mr. Thaler recused himself from voting on this item.

In response to a comment from Mr. Thaler, Ms. Rising added for clarification that the staff survey did not explore aspects of the Choate House stone’s source and color but focused primarily on updating the National Register documentation with the purpose of filing an addendum to the survey currently on file with the State. She also explained that the National Register of Historic Places considers the interior of a structure as well as the exterior when it comes to the significance of architectural details. The planned survey addendum to the existing documentation would include the recognition of the noted architectural changes over time and other historic corrections. Ms. Rising said that in spite of the additional information, she believed the building’s National Register eligibility would remain in place.

**Citing County Code Section, Sec 32-7-302**

**6.** 4609 Prospect Avenue, Glyndon, Non-contributing structure in the Glyndon County Historic District; Ex post facto door replacement (Code Enforcement Correction # CB1800730) [County Council District # 2]

Approved via the Consent Agenda to issue an Ex Post Facto Certificate of Appropriateness.

*(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Additions & Infill, p. 4) County Code, Sec 32-7-405; 32-7-403*

**7.** 218 West Seminary Avenue, Lutherville, Contributing structure in the Lutherville County Historic District; Rebuild existing sidewalk; Addition of fieldstone pillars/planters [County Council District # 3]

Approved via the Consent Agenda to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

*(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Fences & Landscape, p. 3) County Code, Sec 32-7-403*

8. “Towson Police Station”, 308 Washington Avenue, Towson, Final Landmarks List # 83 MIHP # BA-1439; Remove/Add/Resize existing windows as part of adaptive reuse; Install exterior roof access ladder to rear elevation [County Council District # 5]

Ms. Rising gave an overview of the proposal and explained that some work had already begun on the interior and exterior elevations as part of a permit approved and released by the Department of Permits, Approvals and Inspections in conjunction with the building’s conversion into apartments. The permit described the work as limited to the interior, however, exterior details were included with the building plans that were not fully outlined on the permit.
released by staff. Ms. Rising indicated that the exterior work in progress was limited to the ca. 1953 wing on the western and southern elevations. The proposed window alterations on the northern elevation had not yet begun. Since the alley elevation was not visible from the public view, nor did the work involve any significant architectural features, staff consulted with the Commission Chair for approval to allow the window replacement work already in progress on this elevation to go forward. All the other window replacements and resizing work outlined on the permit was before the Commission this evening. She added that the applicant was also proposing an exterior roof access ladder to be installed on the western elevation. Information about the building’s history was also provided including the dates of construction and details about past renovations. Ms. Rising explained that no differentiation was made at the time of the original designation between sections of the building that were considered contributing versus non-contributing, however, she indicated that comments from previous staff suggested the 1953 addition was not considered contributing for the purposes of applying the County’s Historic Design Guidelines. Consequently she suggested the Commission look at the window proposal on that section differently than they might on a historic section of the building. Facts about the proposed resizing and replacement of three windows on the northern elevation of the 1938 section was also provided. Ms. Rising added that the replacement and resizing was in response to safety requirements. As the resizing would be contrary to the Historic Design Guidelines and those recommended by the National Park Service, she recommended further consultation with both County fire and code officials to investigate whether or not there was flexibility due to the fact the building was a certified historic structure.

Mr. Brennan recognized Mr. Ernie Rafailides who was speaking on behalf of Towson Station LLC, the owners of the building. Mr. Rafailides also acknowledged the presence of Mr. Tim Wyatt, contractor for the project. He provided some ownership background and went on to explain that they realized their errors with the process and appreciated the staff recommendations. He also explained the project’s purpose, which was to convert the building into seven apartments, six one bedroom apartments and one two bedroom apartment. Mr. Rafailides added that they intended to revise and bring back the windows that were located in the two bedroom unit, the window expansion being necessary in order to make that a two bedroom apartment.

Mr. Rafailides summarized the overall details of the request, including the window installation in the 1953 addition, as depicted on the materials sent to the Commission, as well as the location of the proposed roof access ladder. Mr. Boswell questioned the need for roof access, Mr. Rafailides explained it would be used to access the equipment currently located on the roof and in case of future repairs. Mr. Wyatt clarified it would provide access for electric and mechanical work. Mr. Boswell confirmed there was a flat section of roof in the back of the building.

Referencing the northern elevation drawing, Mr. Brennan observed that the location of the proposed windows were in the 1938 section, which was confirmed by Mr. Rafailides and Ms. Rising. Ms. Rising added that the proposed replacement window materials were not really an issue as the architect indicated those that existed had been replaced in 2002. She indicated
that staff had worked with fire and code officials a number of times before in other adaptive reuse projects to reconcile safety needs along with the preservation needs. Ms. Rising acknowledged the resizing may be the outcome but added it was worth having the conversation. In response to a question from Mr. Boswell, Ms. Rising clarified that while fire and code officials are given some flexibility, the outcome could be that the resizing of the three windows are necessary to meet safety requirements.

Mr. Brennan asked if the need for an egress window was due to the fact it was located in a bedroom which was confirmed by Mr. Rafailides. Mr. Brennan suggested it was only necessary to have one window serve as egress instead of all three. Mr. Wyatt indicated he believed the architect proposed all three to create the same symmetry. He added that of the three windows, either of the two to the right could be altered instead. The left window was located in the shower. Mr. Wyatt explained that it was a life/safety issue and he thought it would mean a four to six inch (window) movement downward. In addition, depending upon the type of window sizing, they may already have the width they need for the life/safety.

Mr. Boswell asked to clarify the procedure due to the fact an application was not made in advance and if it was a tax credit project. Ms. Rising confirmed it was not a tax credit project.

Ms. Horst recalled that when similar projects were brought to the Commission someone from the Fire Department has already looked at the plans. She asked Mr. Rafailides if the building had been inspected by the Fire Inspector or if they had made recommendations. He confirmed that the Fire Department reviewed the plans as part of the permitting process but did not know if they had reviewed this application specifically. Ms. Horst also asked if the Fire Department had communicated the need for egress from the bedroom windows and if they had commented on whether or not the proposed windows would work. Mr. Wyatt confirmed that they had not made a field visit and explained that part of the plans review process was to make sure the size of the windows were in keeping with the code. He added that he did not know if there was some latitude as they had not had that conference with anyone from the Fire Department. Ms. Rising explained that what Mr. Wyatt stated was correct and usually the architect or applicant are the ones who initiate the conversation with the code officials and Fire Department if the building was historic. She cited the Valley Inn and Mount De Sales as examples of having received modifications from typical codes because the buildings were certified historic structures. Ms. Rising added it was often necessary to initiate the conversation with those officials, which was also recommended by Ms. Horst. Both Mr. Rafailides and Mr. Wyatt confirmed their intention to do this with both code and fire officials.

Mr. Boswell moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the exterior ladder installation & window alterations involving the 1953 addition as proposed and not to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness or Notice to Proceed for the window resizing and subsequent replacement of the three windows on the north façade pending further discussions with the Fire Department. Mr. Thaler seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.
Prior to the introduction of the next item, Mr. Thaler asked whether or not a setting had been approved for the Choate House and its size. Ms. Rising confirmed that it had and encompassed the entire parcel, 2.18 acres total.

9. “Springfield” and setting, (Whitehurst property), 12605 Dulaney Valley Road; Final Landmarks List # 275; MIHP # BA-0412; Reconstruct/Removal of inoperable exterior brick chimney stack; replacement of brick on chimneys; installation of copper gutter, drain, and downspouts on rear [County Council District # 3]

Ms. Rising introduced the project which included the repair/reconstruction of 3 inoperable brick chimney stacks and the installation of copper gutters to the rear bay window of the house in continuation of previously approved copper gutters on other parts of the roof. She explained that both proposals were for historic tax credits but that staff was unclear on the exact scope of the work involving the chimney repairs due to the quality of the photographs submitted with the application. She added that it was difficult to establish the baseline of the condition without contextual and labeled photos that identified the features and related scope of work. Ms. Rising stated that specific mortar treatments were recommended by the National Park Service depending on the type of work proposed. She acknowledged the urgency of the applicant’s request and suggested the Commission delegate the authority to staff to approve the chimney repairs as an emergency item contingent on adequate photographic documentation with the work performed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards.

Mr. Brennan recognized property owner, Ms. Wendy Whitehurst, and invited her to summarize the project. She indicated they have had problems with the one chimney and wished to take it down because it was non-functioning. She thought it was part of the original house but when they added the other part in the 1920s they just left the top and cut the rest. Ms. Whitehurst described weather-related cracking from last winter and they had major water damage inside which she indicated required extensive repairs on separate occasions. A contractor they hired to repair the chimney discovered additional cracking when they were on the roof and pieces of brick were on the ground because of the cold weather and age. Mr. Boswell asked to clarify the location of chimney on the pictures, Ms. Whitehurst indicated it was the chimney that did not go anywhere. Mr. Brennan requested more clarification with the photos as did several other Commission members. Mr. Hord added it was difficult to tell from the pictures they had.

Ms. Rising commented that staff did not have an issue with the proposal, but without contextual photos they had a hard time determining the involvement of the different chimneys and the nature of the work proposed. Ms. Whitehurst asked if there were any larger pictures,
Ms. Rising indicated the pictures being referenced as part of the discussion were those submitted with the application and the required basis for review.

Ms. Whitehurst explained there were two chimneys that needed to be addressed, either taken down or repaired, and attempted to identify them in the application photos. Mr. Boswell remarked that it was a problem without the chimneys being numbered on the plan more specifically. Mr. Thaler asked how many chimneys there were which drew different responses from Ms. Rising and Ms. Whitehurst. Ms. Rising clarified that three chimneys were mentioned on the application. Ms. Whitehurst indicated that the fourth chimney was on the other part of the house and did not have a problem.

In response to Mr. Thaler’s request to describe the proposal more clearly, Ms. Whitehurst pointed out specific locations on the photos of the depicted broken bricks that were causing interior water damage and the previous attempted repairs. He also asked for confirmation that the chimneys were historic. Ms. Rising confirmed that all the chimneys were historic and added that staff had no complaints about the scope of the proposed work. She reiterated that the concern was with the documentation and being able to determine which chimney was involved based on the scope of work to use as comparison to the Part III application.

Mr. Thaler commented that he did not see a problem other than documentation. Ms. Whitehurst asked for guidance on the type of photos they would need, Ms. Rising explained that labeling the chimneys and providing contextual photos would support the photos already submitted.

Mr. Hord suggested the spalling depicted on the photos had something to do with the mortar work. Mr. Boswell agreed and observed the crown was also cracked. He added that he believed it to be repairable. Ms. Whitehurst said that location was not the source of the water and that presently the chimney was tarped due to the recent rainfall. Based on the pictures, Mr. Boswell recommended that potentially individual bricks could be cut out and replaced, however, Ms. Whitehurst disagreed. Mr. Boswell added that he did not have enough pictures, but on those he reviewed, no spalling was observed nor was there the extent of damage that would suggest the chimney needed replacement. Both Mr. Boswell and Mr. Thaler asked Ms. Whitehurst for additional clarification about the condition of the bricks as depicted on the photos.

Ms. Whitehurst explained that both contractors who evaluated the non-operable chimney concluded it could not be repaired and needed replacement.

Mr. Hord noted that the discussion was not moving forward and suggested a motion be made with the delegation of the review to staff. He added that there was not enough information or clarity. Ms. Rising confirmed it could be handled as an emergency tax credit item and could also share the amended submission with the Commission Chair to make sure there was concurrence. She added that it was just a matter of getting things organized.
Mr. Hord moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the copper gutter, drain and downspout installation and to delegate to the Department of Planning the authority to approve, on behalf of the Commission, the Part II of the tax credit application involving emergency repair requests for the work involving the 3 chimneys contingent on proper photo documentation being submitted; the work must be accomplished in accordance with the guidance provided in Preservation Brief # 2 – Repointing Joints in Historic Masonry Building.

Mr. Thaler seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.

(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Roofs, p. 4; National Park Service, Technical Preservation Services, Preservation Brief # 2 – Repointing Joints in Historic Masonry Buildings) County Code, Sec 32-7-403; 11-2-201; Resolution establishing Emergency Situations Under Which The Department of Planning may Approve Part II of a Tax Credit Application (Adopted October 8, 2009)

**10.** Thompson property, 5006 Tulip Avenue, Relay; Contributing structure in the Relay County Historic District; Part II approval for in-kind roof replacement [County Council District # 1]

Approved via the Consent Agenda to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness.

(Citing Baltimore County Historic Design Guidelines: Roofs, p. 10) County Code, Sec 32-7-403; 11-2-201

11. “Scott’s Tavern House, Stone Outbuilding, Log Outbuilding” & setting, 11806 Greenspring Avenue; Final Landmark # 324; MIHP # BA-2311; Part II approval for gutter replacement; Part II approval for replacement of wood porch columns with fiberglass columns [County Council District # 2]

Ms. Rising summarized the proposed project which involved two separate tax credit applications. The application involving the gutters was already approved by the Maryland Historical Trust as part of a larger request and listed under reported tax credit applications. Since this part of the request involved an exterior alteration, staff was bringing it to the Commission for review. She explained that the second application involved the replacement of existing wood porch posts with fiberglass posts, and discussed the treatment guidelines for historic porches which typically recommends repair or replacement in kind.

Mr. Brennan determined that no one was present who wished to comment on the proposal.

Mr. Boswell asked if the State had approved the fiberglass replacement, Ms. Rising replied that the State had not approved this work with the other tax credit application and added it was an entirely separate proposal. Ms. Rising noted that Mr. Brennan had also pointed out that this type of replacement would typically be of concern to the State.

Mr. Brennan commented that from the photographs he observed the shaft and capitals of the column to be in pretty good condition and suggested that it was the base of the column that needed repair or replacement. He added that the bottom piece could often be ordered
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individually and substituted. Mr. Thaler indicated he was unaware that could be done and agreed it seemed to be what was needed. He suggested the Commission adopt the staff recommendation.

Mr. Boswell moved to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the gutter replacement and not to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness for the replacement of the wood porch posts with fiberglass posts. Mr. Diggs seconded the motion.

Mr. Hord commented that the Commission would approve the work if it were replacement in kind, Ms. Rising replied that because it was a tax credit a new application with the details would need to be submitted.

The motion passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.

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

“Scott’s Tavern House, Stone Outbuilding, Log Outbuilding” & setting, 11806 Greenspring Avenue, MIHP # BA-2311; emergency in-kind repair/replacement of chimney and roof. [County Council District # 2]

Grybauskas Property, 115 Fairfield Drive, Contributing Structure in Central Catonsville and Summit Park Historic District; MHT approval of repair and replacement of chimney liner and fireplace/capping, basement interior drain and sump pump installation, and waterproofing. [County Council District # 1]

Sybert Property, 122 Dunkirk Road, Contributing Structure in Rodgers Forge National Register Historic District; MHT approval of HVAC installation and repair/refinishing up hardwood floors and staircase. [County Council District # 5]

Rees Property, 209 Hopkins Road, Contributing Structure in the Rodgers Forge National Register Historic District; MHT approval of window replacement and repair/replacement of slate roofing. [County Council District # 5]

**Other Business**

Ms. Rising noted the Technical Committee report in the back pocket of the binder regarding the tax credit application involving a geo-thermal project for the property at 1100 Copper Hill Road discussed at the November 8th, 2018 meeting. The Commission had appointed a Technical Committee at the meeting to review an updated submission and the referenced report included their final recommendation. Having reviewed the additional information submitted by the applicant and the materials from the County’s files supplied by Ms. Justice, Mr. Brennan said
the group went back to the core issue which was that the County had already given a tax credit for the geo-thermal system and were not parties to poor performance and design. He added that the recommendation was to not give tax credits for the repair of the geo-thermal system, but give tax credits for the new air conditioning system. Mr. Boswell commented that he thought it was the right thing to do. Mr. Thaler asked why the County was giving tax credits for air conditioning systems and noted they were not historic. Mr. Boswell explained that it had to do with making the building more usable and the tax credit law needed to be flexible to allow for change over time. He shared that he too had concerns about this initially but added that he felt most people in society considered it a basic need. Mr. Hord commented that air conditioners also dehumidified the interiors of buildings. Mr. Thaler acknowledged they made good points.

Mr. Brennan asked if the applicants had responded to the final recommendation, Ms. Rising confirmed they had not.

Mr. Thaler moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Myer seconded the motion which passed with affirmative votes being cast by Mr. Boswell, Mr. Brennan, Mr. Diggs, Mr. Hord, Ms. Horst, Mr. Kellman, Ms. McIver, Mr. Myer and Mr. Thaler. There were no dissenting votes.

The meeting adjourned at 7:13 p.m.
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