



APPROVED MARCH 9, 2022

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION HYBRID IN-PERSON/REMOTE ONLINE MEETING
FEBRUARY 9, 2022
ROOM CH-14 + WebEx**

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Ms. Kim Parati, (Chairperson)
Mr. P.J. Henningson (Vice Chairperson)
Ms. Jessica Hindman (2nd Vice Chairperson)
Mr. Chris Barth
Ms. Nichelle Bonaparte
Mr. Phil Goodwin
Mr. Jim Haden
Ms. Christa Lineberger
Mr. Chris Muryn
Ms. Jill Walker
Mr. Scott Whitlock

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

OTHERS PRESENT: Ms. Kristi Harpst, Administrator Historic District Commission
Ms. Candice Leite, Staff to the Historic District Commission
Ms. Cindy Kochanek, Staff to the Historic District Commission
Ms. Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission
Ms. Jill Sanchez-Myers, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Mary Ann Agerrie, Court Reporter

With a quorum present Chairperson Parati called to order the February 9, 2022. hybrid in-person, remote online meeting at 1:32 p.m. Chairperson Parati began the meeting by introducing the Staff, the Commissioners, and explaining the meeting's procedure. Participants in today's evidentiary hearings were required to submit a copy of any presentation, document, exhibit, or other material that they wished to submit at the evidentiary hearing prior to today's meeting. All such materials, as well as a copy of City staff's presentations and documents, were posted online prior to today's meeting. No case is proceeding today in which anyone contacted the City to object to the remote, online meeting platform. The review of each application consists of the Presentation of the application and Deliberation. The application is presented by the HDC staff. The Commission will first determine if there is enough information to proceed with the hearing. The applicant will present their testimony for the application. Other parties wishing to speak, for or against, will be given reasonable time to present factual sworn testimony based on the HDC Design Standards. The HDC may question the applicant and

HDC staff members. HDC staff and the applicant will be given an opportunity for rebuttal and final comments. The HDC shall close the hearing for discussion and deliberation. During discussion and deliberation only the Commission and staff may speak. An HDC member may request the hearing to be opened for further questioning. The HDC will craft a motion for Approval, Continuation, or Denial. The majority vote of the Commission present is required for a decision to be reached. A final vote by the HDC will end the hearing. Chairperson Parati asked that the following guidelines be followed during the meeting; mute your audio when you're not speaking, use only one source of audio (computer or phone), do not put your phone on hold, make sure you are in a quiet area, turn off or silent electronic devices, and do not speak over the person talking or you will be asked to leave the meeting. Lastly, use the "raise your hand" tool, and please do not speak unless recognized by the Chair or staff. Because the Commission is a quasi-judicial body any speaker FOR or AGAINST an application must be sworn in. Due to the hybrid nature of today's proceedings, any individual wishing to speak for or against an application was asked to sign-up and provide any additional evidence in advance of the meeting. During the hearing Chairperson Parati will further open the floor to anyone who has joined the meeting by telephone. Speakers will begin by stating their name and address. Chairperson Parati swore in all applicants and staff and continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting.

INDEX OF ADRESSES:

CONSENT AGENDA

HDCRMI 2022-00030, 720 E. Park Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2022-00039, 2127 Sarah Marks Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2021-01056, 524 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights
HDCRMI 2021-01077, 301 E. Kingston Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2022-00034, 325-331 East Boulevard	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2022-00057, 2010 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood

CONTINUED FROM SEPTEMBER 8 MEETING

HDCRMI 2021-00305, 400 E. Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2021-00363, 329 W. Park Avenue	Wilmore

CONTINUED FROM DECEMBER 8 MEETING

HDCRMA 2021-00507, 2200 Charlotte Drive	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2021-00451, 1836 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood

NEW CASES

HDCRMA 2021-00660, 704 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDCRMI 2021-00506, 607 N. Pine Street	Fourth Ward
HDCRMI 2021-00609, 2128 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI 2021-00915, 404 W. Kingston Avenue	Wilmore
HDCRMI 2021-00916, 629 S. Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDCRMA 2021-00917, 816 Walnut Avenue	Wesley Heights

CONSENT AGENDA

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2022-00030, 720 E. PARK AVENUE (PID: 12311526)
Applicant deferred this application to March.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2022-00039, 2127 SARAH MARKS AVENUE (PID: 12112206) – WINDOW CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1-story Bungalow built c. 1926. Architectural features include a clipped side gable roof with triangular brackets, gabled hood at the front entry of the engaged porch (now infilled), a prominent front chimney, 6/1 double-hung windows and cedar shake siding. The lot size is approximately 50' x 125'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1 and 1.5-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is for changes to windows in a formerly enclosed front porch. The existing windows are six-light casements and are being changed to single light casements, to give the enclosure a more open appearance. Windows are sash-kits with no changes to trim.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for Front Porches, 4.8, Windows, 4.14, and New Construction, Chapter 6.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with permit-ready construction drawings submitted to staff for final review, with the following Conditions:
 - a. Provide manufacturer specifications that meet HDC standards for the new windows.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION 1: REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA

1st: WALKER 2nd: HADEN

Ms. Walker moved to pull item two from the Consent Agenda.

VOTE: 10/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, PARATI, WALKER, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

MOTION 2: APPROVED

1st: HINDMAN 2nd: HADEN

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application based on the reduction in the non-conformance of the previously enclosed front porch and the removal of non-conforming window types, citing Standard 4.8 number 6.

VOTE: 9/1

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, PARATI, WHITLOCK

NAYS: WALKER

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR WINDOW CHANGES APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER

RECUSE: PARATI

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-01056, 524 GRANDIN ROAD (PID: 07102242) – ACCESSORY BUILDING

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Known as the Bradley House, the existing structure is a 1-story English Cottage built c. 1930. Architectural features include a steeply-pitched side gable roof with a front-facing cross gable over the slightly off-center entry. Doorway is unadorned but for a simple gable door hood and original wood windows are 6/1. The engaged corner porch has been infilled. The house is unpainted brick, including the exterior chimney on the left elevation. The lot size is approximately 53' x 203'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1, 1.5, 2-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the construction of a new accessory structure. Proposed height is 20' and the main house sits at 20'-3". Property grade drops approximately 2', which will result in the accessory building sitting approximately 2'-3" lower than the primary structure. The building footprint measures approximately 32'-1 3/32" x 17'-0". Materials proposed to be wood board and batten siding, wood corner boards and trim, and a brick foundation. Windows will be double-hung wood, Anderson E-Series in a 6/1 pattern to match the primary structure. No trees are proposed for removal as part of this project. No other site features are proposed for approval as part of this project.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for Accessory Buildings, page 8.9.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with permit-ready construction drawings submitted to staff for final review, with the following Conditions:
 - a. Provide manufacturer specifications that meet HDC standards for the new windows and doors.

- b. Provide final drawings that show the roof and window trim details correctly on the plans.
 - c. Provide updated floor plans and elevation to show accurate stair construction details.
 - d. Provide rear yard permeable open space calculations.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Henningson’s invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

1st: HINDMAN 2nd: GOODWIN

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application because it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for accessory buildings with the following conditions; the applicant is to provide manufacturer specifications for the new doors and windows that meet the Historic District Commission Standards. The applicant is to provide final drawings that show the roof and window trim details correctly on the plans. The application is to provide updated floor plans and elevations that show accurate stair construction details. The applicant is to provide rear yard permeable open space calculations and that the windows are to be true individual units to coordinate with the house and not pre-mold clusters.

VOTE: 9/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, WALKER, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER

RETURNED: PARATI, 2:02 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-01077, 301 E. KINGSTON AVENUE (PID: 12307601) – SWIMMING POOL

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 2.5-story Queen Anne house built c. 1900. Architectural features include an asymmetrical façade, hip roof with gabled projections and gable dormers, wrap-around front porch supported by Tuscan columns, 1/1 double-hung windows, wood laps siding and a brick foundation. The hip roof side extension and Porte cochère on the right elevation is a newer addition. The lot size is approximately 89.5’ x 100’. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1.5, 2 and 2.5-story residential and commercial buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is a new swimming pool, outdoor kitchen, and fencing. The house is oriented to Kingston and it appears that 1621 Cleveland was carved from this parcel, leaving this lot with zero rear yard. Proposed materials for the outdoor kitchen and fencing are brick to match existing on the main house. The fence pickets and gate(s) will be metal.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for Additions, page 6.20, Sidewalks and Parking, page 8.2, Landscaping and Lawns, page 8.4, and Fences and Walls, page 8.6.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with permit-ready construction drawings submitted to staff for final review, with the following Conditions:
 - a. Staff to work with applicant on all fencing changes to bring proposed fencing into compliance with Design Standards.
 - b. Reconfigure the pool to accommodate driveway up to the covered area, so as not to create front yard parking.
 - c. Enlarge the man-gate to a single-car driveway gate between the house and the pool.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Mr. Curtis Krumel, adjacent property owner, spoke against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: BONAPARTE

Mr. Henningson moved to continue this application based on Standard 8.2 number 6, no front yard parking and all driveways must extend to the rear of the building.

VOTE: 10/0 **AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, PARATI, WALKER, WHITLOCK
NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR SWIMMING POOL CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2022-00034, 325-331 EAST BOULEVARD (PID: 12307506, 12307507) – NEW CONSTRUCTION (MULTI-FAMILY) HEIGHT CHANGE

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

325 East Boulevard was demolished in 2015. The former building was a 2 ½-story Craftsman, frame. Broad side gabled block with exposed rafter ends, wood shingled on second and half stories, weather boarded below. Engaged porch on square posts on piers. Front gable projection with flanking shed dormers. Gabled entry. ca. 1915.” The building was listed as a contributing structure in the Dilworth National Register of Historic Places.

On August 11, 2021, the Commission approved the construction of two multi-family buildings located on two parcels at the corner of East Boulevard and Euclid Avenue, application #HDCRMA-2021-00252.

PROPOSAL:

Due to engineering and site requirements, the heights of the buildings have increased approximately 2 ½” at the front elevation (East Blvd) and approximately 1.34’ at the rear of the building.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for New Construction, Chapter 6.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with permit-ready construction drawings submitted to staff for final review.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED 1st: BARTH 2nd: GOODWIN

Mr. Barth moved to approve this application as presented based on Standards for New Construction, Chapter 6.

VOTE: 10/0 **AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, PARATI, WALKER, WHITLOCK
NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION (MULTI-FAMILY) APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: LINEBERGER

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2022-00057, 2010 THE PLAZA (PID: 09506101, 09506102, 09506131, AND 09506130) – NEW CONSTRUCTION – DESIGN CHANGES

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The property at 2010 The Plaza is the Van Landingham Estate, a designated local historic landmark. The four-acre property has two accessory buildings with fairly dense landscaping.

On May 12, 2021, the Commission approved the construction of four new buildings that comprise a total of 22 townhomes.

- Ten (10) units are accessed from The Plaza and face the main house.
- Twelve (12) units are accessed from Belvedere Avenue and face Thurmond Place.
- Height of units fronting The Plaza and Belvedere are 33’-6” (The height of the Van Landingham Estate is 35’-7” based on the most current Zoutewelle survey).
- Heights of all other units is 35’6”

- Proposed material palette is Nichiha Savannah Smooth siding, Miratec (trim), brick, aluminum clad windows with brick mold trim/fiber cement trim.
- Roof details include wood fascia and brackets
- Other site features include landscaping, tree planting, and new driveways and walkways.
- All HVAC equipment will be placed behind parapet screen wall of roof. See detail 04 on sheet A-3.0.
- All trash & recycle cans will be roll out type. No dumpsters will be used on project.
- Mailboxes to be determined by post office. Mail will either be delivered to individual units or to a central mailbox as required by the USPS.

PROPOSAL:

The project is for design changes to building number one, which faces The Plaza. No other buildings are submitted for design review at this time. Plans are bubbled with notes. Additional changes that do not appear to be called out include:

Front Elevation

- Material change from masonry to siding.
- Large feature windows changed from ganged 1/1 single-hung to fixed windows.

Estate Elevation (left)

- HAVC units moved from the roof to the ground.
- Combination of dormers and elimination of dormers.

Alley Elevation (right)

- Fenestration changes. Elimination of windows located in spaces above entry doors.
- Material changes, masonry eliminated and changed to siding.

Rear Elevation

- Off-set eliminated, dormer added, wall is now coplanar.
- Roof above entry door changed; window above entry door eliminated.
- Large feature windows changed from ganged 1/1 single-hung to fixed windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for New Construction, Chapter 6.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with permit-ready construction drawings submitted to staff for final review.
3. If requested by a Commission member, or if an interested party has signed up to speak in opposition, then the HDC shall open the application for a full hearing.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION 1: REMOVE FROM CONSENT AGENDA

1st: HINDMAN 2nd: HADEN

Ms. Hindman moved to remove this application from the Consent Agenda for a full review.

VOTE: 10/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, PARATI, WALKER, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

MOTION 2: DENIED

1st: MURYN 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Muryn moved to deny this application because it does not meet, past reviews and approval, Standards 6.2 context, 6.5 spacing; 6.6 orientation as it is on-site relating to the old building, 6.7 massing as it relates to the overall height of the storage structure 6.8 height and width as it relates to historic structure and also within the structure itself with the individual units 6.9 scale, 6.10 directional expression as it faces The Plaza and historical building, 6.11 roof forms and materials 6.13 cornices and trim, 6.14 all caps, doors and windows 6.15-16, materials 6.18; size 6.5 and 6; rhythm 6.15 and 16 and landscaping chapter 8.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment to take porch materials off the motion.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment for massing Standard 6.8 the relationship of the units to each other.

VOTE: 10/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, PARATI, WALKER, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION DENIED.

CONTINUED FROM SEPTEMBER 8 MEETING

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00305, 400 E. WORTHINGTON AVENUE (PID: 12105718) ACCESSORY BUILDING
Application withdrawn by applicant.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ARRIVED: LINEBERGER, 4:46 PM

RECUSED: HENNINGSON

LEFT: BONAPARTE, 4:46 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00363, 329 W. PARK AVENUE (PID: 11908618) – WINDOW REPLACEMENT

This application was continued from the September 8, 2021 meeting for the following items:

- Provide specifications on these 15 remaining windows that have been purchased, and

- Provide evidence that these windows are not able to be repaired by reaching to out a (window restoration) company who can make that judgment call.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story Bungalow style house constructed in 1926 with a partial front porch with a gable roof. Other features include a side-gable roof with brackets, a brick chimney and painted brick foundation. A rear addition was added in 2008 prior to the creation of the Wilmore Local Historic District. An addition was approved by the Commission on February 12, 2020 (COA# HDCRMA-2019-00812).

PROPOSAL:

The project is the total replacement of window sashes. Original trim to remain.

Revised Proposal

- No revisions provided by applicant, despite repeated attempts by staff to reach out in writing regarding project status and the required decision-date for this project.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. A decision is required per N.C.G.S. 160-947(d), which limits the Commission to a 180-days to render a decision on applications.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: DENIED

1st: WALKER 2nd: HADEN

Ms. Walker moved to deny this application for window replacement because of submission requirements in the Rules of Procedure 7.3.1, staff’s request for specifications on the windows as well as evidence from a restoration company that windows cannot be repaired, in addition to not meeting Standards 4.14 numbers 10, 11, and 13.

VOTE: 9/0

AYES: BARTH, GOODWIN, HADEN, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, WALKER, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR WINDOW REPLACEMENT DENIED.

CONTINUED FROM DECEMBER 8

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BONAPARTE

RECUSED: HINDMAN

RETURNED: HENNINGSON, 3:51 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2021-00507, 2200 CHARLOTTE DRIVE (PID: 12112410) – ADDITION

This application was continued from the December 8, 2021 meeting for the following items:

1. Per Standard 7.2.1, minimize the impact of addition from the street;
2. Per Standard 7.2.2, limit the size of addition so it does not overpower existing structure;
3. Per Standard 6.10, roof forms should not be out of scale with the existing structure:
 - Study roof form to see if it can be made less complex
 - Make sure that all drawings consistently reflect the accurate dimensions of how high the roof is being raised
 - Include a graphic that better illustrates the impact of the addition from the front elevation once the roof is raised in relation to the original house.
4. Redo the open space calculation to include the original rear thermal wall.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a one-story, Craftsman bungalow with Tudor Revival elements constructed c. 1928. Architectural features include a partial width front porch with stucco and wood 'half-timbering' front gable roof supported by square brick columns. The left bay of the front porch is screened. Other details include an all brick exterior (unpainted), 4/1 double-hung wood windows, exterior brick chimney, and unique triangular roof vent details. A previous rear addition was added at the back left rear corner of the building and a former rear stoop was enclosed with shake siding on the rear elevation. Lot size is 50' x 155'. Surrounding structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family buildings. The existing partial front porch enclosure and rear addition were approved by the Commission in December 2004 (COA and meeting documents attached).

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is for a cross-gable addition that raises the ridge approximately 1'-8½". The building footprint remains unchanged. Existing areas of wood shake siding that enclose a former rear entry, on the right and rear elevations will be changed to brick. The roof of the addition will extend over an open patio and be supported by square brick columns to coordinate with the front porch. A brick half-wall will be built between the existing rear wall of the house and the column supporting the roof over the patio. The screens will be removed from the front porch. No changes proposed to windows/doors on the original house. Proposed materials of the addition include stucco and timbering to coordinate with the front porch roof. New windows are proposed to be Kolbe Ultra Series aluminum clad with 3/1 Simulated True Divided Lights (STD L) and wood trim.

Revised Proposal

- Addition raises the ridge approximately 2'-6".
- Roof design changed to a larger cross gable.
- Left elevation cross gable has a shed roof.
- Rear yard permeable open space calculations provided, 71.7% permeable post-construction.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Minor changes may be reviewed and approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: GOODWIN 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Goodwin moved to continue this application based on Standard for roof forms 6.10.

VOTE: 9/0

AYES: BARTH, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, LINEBERGER,
MURYN, PARATI, WALKER, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: BONAPARTE

RETURNED: HINDMAN, 4:27 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2021-00451, 1836 THE PLAZA (PID: 09506132) – NEW CONSTRUCTION

This application was continued from the December 8, 2021 meeting for the following items:

- **Massing [Page 6.5].** Restudy of the massing of the front of the structure.
- **Accurate/Detailed Plans.** Provide a complete, accurate set of drawings/plans incorporating all details discussed in the meetings including but not limited to materials, details, dimensions, notations, etc.
- **Porches [Page 6.14].**
 - For the column-to-beam relationship on the front porch, the beam width should align with the column neck on both sides, interior & exterior.
 - Provide an accurate/appropriate relationship between the brick piers and railings on the front porch.
 - Provide accurate/appropriate railing details on the front porch.
- **Sidewalks and Parking [Page 8.2].** Driveway to be modified to a 3/3/3 configuration with carriage strips.
- **Cornices and Trim [Page 6.11] & Doors and Windows [Page 6.12-6.13].** Provide accurate/appropriate trim thickness and details around windows, corner boards, and doors.
- Either of the brick options of those presented in the meeting are considered appropriate.
- Replacement tree species to comply with the approved tree species list.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing parcel is a vacant lot. The lot was previously part of 1830 The Plaza. Lot size is approximately 66' x 170'. An alley runs behind the property. Adjacent structures are a 2 story multi-family apartment building and 1, 1.5 and 2 story single-family buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal includes the construction of a new single-family structure and detached accessory building. The proposed new 1.5 story structure has a height of 27'-11 15/16". The building width is 45'-11 1/2".

Proposed siding materials are brick veneer, lap siding with trim, and decorative brackets. Shake siding is used as an accent in many of the gable ends. Proposed windows appear to be a mix of double-hung and fixed/awning aluminum clad wood windows. Roofing is asphalt shingle with metal shed accent roofs on the front and rear. The accessory building is proposed for the right rear corner of the property and matches the design & style of the proposed main structure.

Revised Proposal – November 10, 2021

- Ridge height modified.
- More information/documentation provided on alley & existing site conditions/elements.
- Landscape plan provided.
- Rear yard impervious area provided (further breakdown is needed, can work with staff on details).
- Distance between adjacent structures provided.
- Solid paneling removed in lieu of shake siding in gable ends.
- Shed awning over the front porch omitted; still shown on A400.
- Narrow windows removed at rear on North elevation; one paired set remains.
- Apron trim removed.
- Pedestrian door changed on side entry/south elevation.
- Porch ceiling material labeled tongue & groove pine.
- Brick water table removed.
- Straight chimney provided; tapered still shown on A400.

Revised Proposal – December 8, 2021

- Ridge height modified.
- Additional notes/labels on elevations and detail page including plank and shake siding indicated.
- Labels indicate a brick skirt/foundation on all four elevations of the main structure.
- A103 – shows a 4' wide front walkway and 10' wide driveway in concrete.
- Chimney removed on details page.
- House widths and heights from The Plaza shown on A105-A107.
- 1x5 trim shown for windows; the second set of paired windows have been shifted back and are wider on the north elevation.
- Floor plans included on A300-A301; notes indicate Weather Shield signature series windows.
- Plate height indicated for accessory building; overall height not indicated.
- Additional info on the water sampling station provided.
- Post-construction rear yard permeability will be approx. 59%.

Revised Proposal – February 9, 2022

- Ridge height modified to 26' – 4 ¾" (different height of 26.6' listed on A 105).
- Width modified to 43'.
- Railing and column-to-beam relationship details shown on A 400.
- Brick pier & railing relationship on the front porch shown on A 200.
- 3/3/3 driveway shown on A 103; specific measurements do not appear on the rest of the plans but appear to match that configuration.
- More details provided on door/window trim and corner boards.
- Tree options added to A 103.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Commission to determine if the massing & height reductions are more in keeping with the location and proposed design.
2. Commission to determine if the width & spacing are in keeping with The Plaza.
3. Windows/doors:
 - Drip caps should extend beyond the casing
 - Right side casing missing on the left side window on the north elevation
4. Materials
 - Additional labels/details/specs needed throughout plans on main and accessory building including doors, windows (SDLs?), garage door material, shakes, accessory building foundation material, etc. (many of these can be reviewed by staff for compliance with the Standards)
 - Individually applied shingle/shake siding is required
5. Further details/corrections are needed for the following:
 - Column & beam details still appear incorrect on the elevation/detail pages
 - Specific tree species is staff approvable
 - Overall accessory building height needed
 - Rear yard impervious area provided (further breakdown is needed, staff approvable)
6. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS 1st: BARTH 2nd: GOODWIN

Mr. Barth moved to approve this application with several items to be addressed post-review, for the massing because it meets Standards 6.5, the applicant to work with staff on details regarding the column and beam conditions, trim, windows and doors, siding material, handrails, calling out the top rail of the handrail detail to be reduced to a more appropriate size referencing other details within the community. Applicant to work with staff on drawing coordination and accuracy. The tree species is approved pending any amendments from other commissioners. The applicant is to provide rear yard impervious area calculations. The applicant to increase backband and drip cap details to deeper material to provide adequate termination of siding material at the windows and doors, add trim on the north elevation left window towards the rear of the house. Applicant to provide individually applied wood shingles in the upper portion of the gable roofs and applicant to provide the overall accessory building height to the plan’s final submission.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment the window specification should be within the typically approved windows in the historic districts and the tree being approved must be on the pre-approved city list.

VOTE: 8/2

AYES: BARTH, GOODWIN, HADEN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, WALKER, WHITLOCK

NAYS: HINDMAN, LINEBERGER

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

NEW CASES

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

RETURNED: BONAPARTE, 5:11 PM

LEFT: WALKER, 5:11 PM

APPLICATION:

HDCRMA 2021-00660, 704 WALNUT AVENUE (PID: 07102136) – ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1-story Cottage built c. 1929. Architectural features include a side-gable roof with two front-facing cross gables, the smaller of which shelters the projecting central entry bay, 6/6 double-hung wood windows, and an open side porch connected to an open front porch. The house appears to be wood lap siding with beveled corners, siding wrapped in aluminum and has masonry details (foundation, interior chimney, entry bay). The lot size is approximately 55' x 150'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1, 1.5, 2-story residential buildings.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is a rear addition. The addition is a cross-gable with a small rear bump-out. The addition extends the original ridge with the new gable on the right elevation tying in below the ridge. On the left side the addition bumps out approximately 7'-11' and on the right side it bumps out approximately 4'-4 ¾". Materials will all match existing including the wood siding, window/door/roof trim, vents, and brick pier foundation. Both rear corners of the original house are covered up at the main level; however, a unique solution being proposed is through the foundation treatment to distinguish between the original house and the addition. The new foundation is brick piers which allows the original house foundation to remain visible, including the original rear corners of the house.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Provide a window trim detail with dimensions. (staff approvable)
2. Provide manufacturer specifications that meet HDC standards for the new windows. (staff approvable)
3. The rear elevation photo shows a large tree along the right property line, is the tree still there? If so, needs added to existing site plan.
4. Provide size/species of any new trees to be planted to replace those being removed due to construction of the addition. (staff approvable)
5. Provide rear yard permeability calculations.
6. Minor changes may be reviewed and approved by Staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak FOR or AGAINST this application.

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS **1st: HENNINGSON** **2nd: HINDMAN**

Mr. Henningson moved to approve this application with the following conditions: on the left elevation rotate the steps to the mudroom 90 degrees and reduce the size of the landing to enable pulling the car completely beside the house and eliminate a front yard parking condition. Update the drawings of the rear elevation to show the chimney. Applicant is to provide the rear yard permeability calculations. Applicant is to provide details of the window trim, window manufacturer, and window details for the new windows.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment for the applicant to provide a tree protection plan.

VOTE: 10/0 **AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, MURYN, PARATI, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: WALKER
LEFT: MURYN, 6:00 PM

APPLICATION:
HDCRMI 2021-00506, 607 N. PINE STREET (PID: 07807311) – SIDING/FRONT PORCH STAIR REPLACEMENT

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing property is a 2-story Victorian building with classical elements constructed c. 1900. Architectural features include a unique asymmetrical roof, classical elements include the round porch columns, and eave returns, a unique oval window, a wrap-around front porch, Victorian trim around the front door, and 1/1 windows. The lot size is approximately 45’ x 78’. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1, 1.5 and 2-story single family houses and a 2-story historic commercial structure.

PROPOSAL:
The project is in three parts:

1. Replace the existing vinyl siding with Hardie fiber cement siding. There is no evidence of the original wood siding beneath the vinyl.
2. Replace the cedar shingles on the front 2nd story using a different pattern (fish scale).
3. Install brick stairs for the front porch, to replace the existing wood stairs. Per the applicant the stairs were originally cement and it is unclear when the stairs changed to wood.

STAFF ANALYSIS:
Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The original house was constructed with shingle siding and wood lap siding, see HDC archive photos from the 1970s and 1980s.
2. If original lap wood siding is found when the vinyl siding is removed completely, then that siding should be repaired and new wood siding toothed in to match existing per Design Standards, Rehabilitation of Building Elements, Wood, 5.2 #7, 8, and 9.
3. Any original trim elements that were removed during previous work should be reinstalled, such as the trim piece between the first and second floors on the front elevation (see 1980s Rehabilitation before photo).
4. Siding and trim details and dimensions questions.
 - a. What are the Hardie specifications? Artisan is no longer available, regular Hardie has not been approved due to dimensional qualities not matching those of traditional wood siding.
 - b. How will the new siding relate to the existing window/door trim?
 - c. Will corner boards be used?

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati's invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION 1: DENIED 1st: BONAPARTE 2nd: HENNINGSON

Ms. Bonaparte moved to deny all changes to siding based on Standards 5.2 number 7, 8 and 9 for building materials, wood and the Secretary of Interior Standards 2.5.

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR SIDING DENIED.

MOTION 2: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS 1st: HINDMAN 2nd: HADEN

Ms. Hindman moved to approve the brick stairs with all details to go to staff for final review.

VOTE: 9/0 **AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR BRICK STAIRS APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: MURYN, WALKER

RECUSED: HINDMAN

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00609, 2128 THE PLAZA (PID: 09503501) –ARTIFICIAL TURF

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The property was originally a one-story Craftsman bungalow constructed c 1926. A second level was added in 2008. Architectural features include an asymmetrical façade, partial width front porch that wraps around the left elevation supported by brick piers and tapered wood columns, brackets, wood shingle siding, brick foundation (unpainted), and 6/1 double-hung windows. Lot size is approximately 66’ x 170’. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2 story single-family structures.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the removal of grass in the front yard and replacement with artificial turf.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. The Commission will determine if the project meets the Design Standards.
2. Requests to install turf in front yards has previously been denied by the Commission due to being a non-traditional material and incongruous with the character of the district(s).
3. The Commission permits the usage of turf in rear yards if screened and permeability standards are met.
4. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: DENIED 1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: HADEN

Mr. Henningson moved to deny this application based on Standard 8.4 number 6, 8.4 number 9 and the Secretary of Interior Standards page 2.5. Non-traditional materials should not be used in the front yard, this includes PVC edging and artificial turf.

VOTE: 8/0 **AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON,
LINEBERGER, PARATI, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ARTIFICIAL TURF DENIED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT | RETURNED:

ABSENT: WALKER

RECUSED: HENNINGSON

APPLICATION:

HDCRMI 2021-00915, 404 W. KINGSTON AVENUE (PID: 11908509) –TREE REMOVAL/REPLANTING

The existing structure is one-story, multi-family building constructed c. 1950. The front-gabled building has a concrete stoop, 1/1 windows, and a painted brick exterior. Adjacent structures 1, 1.5 and 2-story single-family and multi-family buildings. The lot size is approximately 55' x 150'. The Commission approved demolition with a 365-day stay on July 14, 2021.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the new construction of a multi-family building. The new structure is approximately 29.3' in height as measured from grade to ridge at its tallest point. Exterior materials are brick with concrete window sills. The trim, window, door, and column materials are not specified. Setback is 20' from property line to the front porch. A full-width 8' deep front porch faces Walnut Avenue.

STAFF ANALYSIS:

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Right elevation fenestration and rhythm.
2. Elevation drawings with dimensions and details.
3. Details needed:
 - a. Beam/column alignment does not look correct.
 - b. Window trim
 - c. Shutters
 - d. Handrails should be built to historically accurate height with a booster rail to achieve code compliance.
 - e. Window/door specifications.
 - f. Roof trim dimensions
4. Setback.
 - a. What is the setback to front thermal wall?
 - b. The former building did not appear to align with historic setbacks on the street. New construction should comply with established setbacks of existing historic structures, more information may be needed about the setbacks of other buildings along Walnut.
5. Site Plan
 - a. HVAC and trash receptacle locations?
 - b. Walkway dimensions/material
 - c. Driveway material
 - d. A retaining wall appears to be proposed along the front property line, details/dimensions needed.
 - e. Will lighting be installed in the rear for the parking area?

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Mrs. Thomasina Massey, adjacent property owner, spoke against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUE

1st: HINDMAN 2nd: HADEN

Ms. Hindman moved to continue this application for 6.1 the Preamble regarding the scale reducing techniques and the context and character of the district. Standard 6.2, setback and understanding the established block face of the thermal wall and porch. Standard 6.3, spacing, and 6.5, massing, with a note to take cues from contextual quadplexes. Standard 6.12, doors, windows, shutters and rhythms. Standard 6.14, porches, and Chapter 8 site details specifically drives, walks and spacing at foundation with additional details needed, including but not limited to notes, dimensions, window specifications, materials, trees, HVAC and trash, lighting and retaining walls.

VOTE: 9/0

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, GOODWIN, HADEN, HENNINGSON,
HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, PARATI, WHITLOCK

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION (MULTI-FAMILY) CONTINUED.

Mr. Henningson moved to approve the September 8, 2021, minutes It was seconded by Ms. Lineberger and the vote was unanimous. 7/0

With no further business to discuss, Ms. Parati adjourned the meeting at 7:26 PM.

Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission