



---

HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
July 12, 2023 | Room 267

MINUTES

- MEMBERS PRESENT: Nichelle Hawkins, Chair  
Kim Parati (Vice Chair)  
Chris Barth (2<sup>nd</sup> Vice Chair)  
Noelle Bell  
Phil Goodwin  
Christa Lineberger  
Brett Taylor  
Jill Walker  
Scott Whitlock  
Heather Wojick
- MEMBERS ABSENT: Sarah Wheat  
Hermitage Court Vacant Seat  
Oaklawn Park Vacant Seat  
McCrorey Heights Vacant Seat
- OTHERS PRESENT: Kristi Harpst, HDC Program Manager  
Jenny Shugart, HDC Staff  
Candice Leite, HDC Staff  
Marilyn Drath, HDC Staff  
Jill Sanchez-Myers, Senior Assistant City Attorney  
Nicole Hewett, Assistant City Attorney  
Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

---

With a quorum present, Chair Hawkins called the July meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:06 pm. Chair Hawkins began the meeting by introducing the Staff and Commissioners and explaining the meeting procedure. All interested parties planning to give testimony – FOR or AGAINST – must submit a form to speak and must be sworn in. Staff will present a description of each proposed project to the Commission. The Commissioners and the Applicants will then discuss the project. Audience members signed up to speak either FOR or AGAINST will be called to the podium for each agenda item. Presentations by the Applicants and audience members must be concise and focused on the **Charlotte Historic District Design Standards**. The Commission and Staff may question the Applicant. The Applicant may present sworn witnesses who will be subject to questioning by the Commission and Staff. The Applicant will be given an opportunity to respond to comments by interested parties. After hearing each application, the Commission will review, discuss, and consider the information that has been gathered and presented. During discussion and deliberation, only the Commission and Staff may speak. The Commission may vote to reopen this part of the

meeting for questions, comments, or clarification. Once the review is completed, a MOTION will be made to Approve, Deny, or Continue the review of the application at a future meeting. A majority vote of the Commission members present is required for a decision to be reached. All exhibits remain with the Commission. If an Applicant feels there is a conflict of interest of any Commissioner, or there is an association that would be prejudicial, that should be revealed at the beginning of the hearing of a particular case. The Commission is quasi-judicial body and can accept only sworn testimony. Staff will report any additional comments received and while the Commission will not specifically exclude hearsay evidence, it is only given limited weight. Chair Hawkins asked that everyone please silence any electronic devices. Commissioners are asked to announce, for the record, if one leaves or arrives during the meeting. Chair Hawkins requested that those in the audience remain quiet during the hearings. An audience member will be asked once to be quiet and the need for a second request will require removal from the room. Chair Hawkins swore in all Applicants and Staff and continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting. Appeals from the Historic District Commission are to the Zoning Board of Adjustment within thirty (30) days from the date of the decision to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance.

Prior to hearing applications, the Commission also discussed the vacant McCrorey Heights seat. Chair Hawkins explained that the original appointment, Samantha Taylor, can no longer serve. Vice Chair Parati moved to rescind the nomination of Ms. Taylor to the McCrorey Heights Commission seat. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion. The motion to rescind Ms. Taylor’s appointment to the Commission passed by a vote of 7/0 with Commissioners Wheat, Barth, Lineberger, and Wojick not voting.

Vice Chair Parati then moved to nominate Shawna Bell to the vacant McCrorey Heights Commission seat. Ms. Walker seconded the motion. The motion to approve the appointment of Ms. Bell to the vacant seat was approved by a vote of 7/0 with Commissioners Wheat, Barth, Lineberger, and Wojick not voting.

**INDEX OF ADDRESSES:**

**CONSENT**

HDCRMI-2023-00501, 701 Berkeley Av	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2023-00502, 1001 Berkeley Av	Dilworth
HDCRMA-2023-00582, 814 East Bv	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2023-00504, 1141 Linganore Pl	Dilworth

**NOT HEARD AT THE JUNE 14 MEETING**

HDCADMRRM-2023-00111, 2101 Dilworth Rd E	Dilworth
HDCDMA-2023-00115, 1921 Charlotte Dr	Dilworth

**CONTINUED FROM THE MAY 10 MEETING**

HDCRMA-2023-00074, 1500 Dilworth Rd	Dilworth
-------------------------------------	----------

**CONTINUED FROM THE JUNE 14 MEETING**

HDCDMI-2023-00237, 420 W 5 <sup>th</sup> St	Fourth Ward
---	-------------

**NEW CASES**

HDCRMI-2023-00256, 2310 Charlotte Dr	Dilworth
HDCRMI-2023-00282, 524 E Kingston Av	Dilworth
HDCRMA-2023-00321, 820 Woodruff Pl	Wesley Heights
HDCRMIA-2022-01157, 317 Westwood Av	Wilmore
HDCRMI-2023-00255, 1226 Myrtle Av	Dilworth
HDCRMIA-2022-01159, 305 W Kingston Av	Wilmore

---

**CONSENT**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: WHEAT, LINEBERGER

**APPLICATION:****HDCRMI-2023-00501, 701 BERKELEY AV (PID: 12309405) – REAR ADDITION & WINDOWS****EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is a one-story brick Ranch c. 1953. Architectural features include a main cross gable roof with pent eave returns, a side porch that has been screened in, and metal windows. The front door has a transom and side lights and is flanked by large picture windows. Exterior is unpainted brick with wood German lap siding in the screen porch gable end. An original, one-story brick garage is located in the rear yard. The lot size is irregular measuring approximately 89' x 105' x 151' x 163'. Adjacent structures are one and two-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is a small rear addition that ties in below the original ridge. The addition will measure approximately 6' x 13' and will be stepped in 58" from the left rear corner of the original house. Proposed materials include unpainted brick foundation to match existing and fiber cement lap siding. The new transom window is proposed on the rear elevation. No trees will be impacted by this project. Post-construction rear yard permeability calculations are not provided. The project would be an Administrative review but for the corner lot location and visibility, which requires Commission review.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for Additions, pages 6.20-6.24, and the Secretary of the Interiors Standards.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6, and the Secretary of the Interior Standards, and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with the following Conditions:
  - a. The roof design is at the owner's discretion.
  - b. Siding should be either wood German lap to match existing or Hardie Artisan smooth finish lap siding with either mitered corners or wood corner boards that sit ¼" proud of the siding.
  - c. Skylights, if used, should be installed on the roof slope interior to the lot not street facing.
  - d. Windows should be aluminum clad.
  - e. Provide material details including, but not limited to, brick sample, siding specifications, and window specifications.
  - f. Provide rear yard 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 Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:      APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS      1<sup>st</sup>:      TAYLOR      2<sup>nd</sup>:      WOJICK**

Mr. Taylor moved to approve the application because it is not incongruous with the Standards, pending the final permit-ready plans follow the concept outlined in the application. Mr. Taylor cited Standards 6.20 and 6.24 the new construction of additions. Chair Hawkins asked if they should discuss the fenestration. Mr. Taylor replied that as long as it was a casement window he was okay with it. He also wanted to recommend the gable, rather than shed option provided by the applicant.

Mr. Barth made a friendly amendment requesting the applicant work with Staff to match the brick to the existing, noting that no brick should be painted. He added that the siding material should conform the Standards and that it should be chosen in consultation with Staff but be either a German lap siding or Hardie Artisan, or a comparable lap siding with mitered corners or wood cornerboards sitting proud of the siding by a quarter inch. Mr. Barth continued his friendly amendment stating that skylights should not be used and that the windows could be aluminum clad but that the applicant should work with Staff on the window proportions, sizing, and light pattern. The eaves, trim, and cornice detail on the addition should all match the existing house, and the applicant needs to provide rear yard calculations to Staff prior to the commencement of the project. For this comment, Mr. Barth cited Standard 6.12 for foundations, 6.13 for roof form and materials, 6.14 for windows and doors, as well as Standards 6.15-6.16 for rhythm and 6.18 for materials. Mr. Taylor accepted Mr. Barth's friendly amendment. Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 9/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, PARATI, TAYLOR, WALKER, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR REAR ADDITION & WINDOWS – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: WHEAT, LINEBERGER

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2023-00502, 1001 BERKELEY AV (PID: 12309108) – WINDOW REPLACEMENT & SIDING**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is a 2-story Dutch Colonial Revival constructed c. 1929. Architectural features include a front gambrel roof with projecting five-light bay, with side gable section and shed dormer. The building has an arched front entry door, 6/1 double-hung windows, and one-story side porch that has been screened. Exterior material is painted brick with a stucco on the shed dormer on the original house and German lap wood siding on the non-original rear addition. The lot size is approximately 154' x 140' x 150' x 166'. Adjacent structures are 1.5 and 2-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is fenestration and roof changes to the first level of the non-original rear addition. There are no changes proposed to the original structure.

On the rear elevation the lower level roof will be rebuilt, the entry door relocated, a triple window installed, and two single fixed windows will be added.

On the left elevation, two windows will be removed, and a new triple casement window will be installed.

On the right elevation, two windows will be removed and two pair of French doors will be installed. New concrete steps will be added under the doors.

Proposed windows and doors are Jeld-Wen Sitrine aluminum clad with 5/8" putty glaze Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL). New German lap wood siding to match existing will be toothed in former openings as needed.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for Doors and Windows, pages 6.15, and the Secretary of the Interiors Standards.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the Standards for New Construction for Residential Buildings, Chapter 6, and the Secretary of the Interior Standards, and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with the following Conditions:
  - a. Provide a window trim detail including mullion dimensions for triple window; picture frame trim is not permitted.
  - b. Work with Staff on left elevation window design. New triple casement window should match the windows on the original house proportionally and have the appearance of being double-hung windows.
  - c. HVAC units must be permanently screened from the street and neighboring properties.
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 Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:      APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS      1<sup>st</sup>:      BARTH      2<sup>nd</sup>:      GOODWIN**

Mr. Barth moved to approve the application as a consent agenda item as it is not incongruous with the district and Design Standards. He added the following amendment that the applicant work with Staff in looking at the rear elevation to make the two casement windows without divided light or in keeping with the windows that are on the historic structure, whether they be double hung, with a six-over-one light pattern, or a casement made to look in this form. Mr. Barth further added that on the left elevation, the triple-ganged windows should be made to look like his previous comments, as double hung, with a six-over-one light pattern, or a casement made to look in this form, and to incorporate proper mull spacing between mull window units as it is reflected on the existing historic structure with at least six inches or greater between mull units. He continued that the applicant should work with Staff to eliminate any picture frame trim, directing them that the trim should terminate into a thicker sill per historic standards. He referenced Standards 6.15 for doors and windows and 6.14 for cornices and trim. Ms. Hawkins asked about the HVAC screening. In response, Mr. Barth added that the applicant should work with Staff to properly screen any proposed or existing HVAC units on the side of the house, citing Standard 8.9 for site appurtenances. Mr. Goodwin seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 9/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, PARATI, TAYLOR, WALKER, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR WINDOW REPLACEMENT & SIDING – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: WHEAT, LINEBERGER

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2023-00582, 814 EAST BV (PID: 12108211) – NEW CONSTRUCTION - REAFFIRMATION**

### **EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The site is a vacant lot. The former building was a 1.5 story Craftsman bungalow constructed c. 1915. Architectural features included a full-width engaged shed-roof front porch supported by piers and square columns, a central dormer, brackets, shingle siding and double-hung wood windows in 8/1 and 6/1 patterns. Lot size is approximately 66' x 200'. There is a solid asphalt driveway located to the left of the parcel and a 10' alley in the rear. Demolition was approved with a 365-day delay by the Commission on July 8, 2020, under application number HDCRDEMO-2020-00208.

### **PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is the construction of a new structure and connector to the adjacent 820 East Blvd. The new building's footprint dimensions are 39'-3¼" by 57'-3". The plans note the building height at 26'-8¾" as measured from finished first floor and the elevation at 752.81, which would place the height as measured from grade to ridge at approximately 28.1'. Setback is approximately 49'-0" to align with the setback of 820 East Blvd. The building width is approximately 45'-4". Proposed siding materials are Hardie fiber cement siding and trim, Hardie board and batten, wood decorative brackets, wood porch railing with a brick foundation. Proposed column material is wood. Proposed windows to be 8/1 double hung, wood. Roofing is asphalt shingle. Many of the building elements, including window design/location, front porch design, and rear dormer design are inspired by the original historic building. The glass connector will be located at the rear of both buildings. This project was submitted prior to the adoption of the new Design Standards and was evaluated under the 2017 Standards under application number HDCRMA-2021-01114.

At the July 13, 2022, meeting the Commission voted to Approve the application with the following Conditions:

- a. Porch railing. The main rail to be disengaged from the pedestal cap down at three feet with a secondary jump rail.
- b. On the front-facing dormer minimize the high-hatted head condition by increasing the window size and header height, re-engaging the brackets with the barge rafter as a graphical note, as well as the band board being engaged with the header trim.

The Decision letter is attached. **Final permit-ready plans were not received within the required timeframe and no COA was issued. The applicant is requesting re-affirmation of the previous approval with the following changes:**

- Plans noted with Hardie fiber cement siding with Hardie fiber cement corner boards and skirt board.
- Board and batten changed from Hardie panel and wood battens to Hardie panel and Hardie battens.
- Dormer slightly re-designed with taller windows.
- Brackets under rear dormer are smaller.
- Right elevation, first level, a window has been removed.
- Porch railing has been redesigned.
- Composite wood decking and treads shown for front porch.
- Beam/column detail relationship changed.

### **STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for New Construction for Non-Residential Buildings, Chapter 7, and the Secretary of the Interiors Standards.
2. Per 10.4.1 of the Rules for Procedure, Staff recommends Approval of the project for meeting the New Construction for Non-Residential Buildings, Chapter 7, and the Secretary of the Interior Standards, and that this item be heard as a Consent Agenda item, with the following Conditions:
  - a. Height dimension shown from finished floor. Total height as measured from grade to ridge on both the right and left side at front elevation should be provided on the final drawings for the COA.
  - b. Provide construction elevations for 820 East Boulevard that match the original approval (only demolition elevations were provided).
  - c. Hardie Artisan lap siding, smooth finish, is approved. Corner board trim is to be wood. No other alternative materials approved.

- d. Composite wood decking and treads not approved for the front porch. Wood tongue and groove 2 ¼" wide porch flooring and wood treads are approved.
  - e. Brick color sample to be provided to and approved by Staff.
  - f. Brackets under rear dormer should be enlarged to match original approval.
  - g. Right elevation, first level design needs to match original approval.
  - h. Beam/column detail needs to match original approval.
  - i. Provide information about front porch ceiling to Staff for review.
  - j. Provide window specifications to Staff for review.
  - k. All mechanical units, including but not limited to, HVAC, backflow preventors, and generators must be permanently screened from street and neighboring property.
  - l. Fencing, trash enclosure screening, and generator screening, should be worked out with Staff.
  - m. Driveway width and materials need labeled on plans and details may be worked out with Staff.
  - n. Exterior lighting details may be worked out with Staff.
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 Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:      APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS                      1<sup>st</sup>:      BELL                      2<sup>nd</sup>:      BARTH**

Ms. Bell made a motion to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for new construction for non-residential buildings in Chapter 7 and the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Rules of Procedure. She added that the approval was conditioned on the items, A through N, listed in the Staff report. Mr. Barth seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 9/0**

**AYES:    BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, PARATI, WALKER, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS:    NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION - REAFFIRMATION – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

**NOT HEARD AT THE JUNE 14 MEETING**

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: WHEAT, LINEBERGER

RETURNED: WALKER

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCADMRM-2023-00111, 2101 DILWORTH RD E (PID: 12112515) – SITE WORK**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing building is a two-story Colonial Revival constructed in 1929. Architectural features include a simple curved hood supported by brackets over the central front entry side gable roof, left side chimney, symmetrical fenestration, and painted brick. The structure also includes an existing left side two-story enclosed side porch addition. The structure sits on a corner lot that measures approximately 66.67' x 160.39'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story, single-family residential buildings.



**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The property is a 2-story Picturesque Revival/Chateausque building constructed c. 1930. Architectural features include a high hip roof center section, lower front gable projection to one side, one-story wing on the left elevation, a semi-circular, conically roofed central tower, metal windows, slate roof, and a massive multi-flue brick chimney. Lot size measures approximately 109' x 180' x 133' x 194'. Adjacent structures are 1.5-, 2-, and 2.5-story single family buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposal is changes to the hardscape that was approved by the Commission at the July 13, 2022 meeting (COA# HDCRMI-2022-00580), including grading for the driveway on the left side of the house, boulders on the left side of the driveway with ivy to eventually cover the boulders, retaining wall on the right side of the driveway that will tie into the approved garden wall that extends from the house, stairs that go from the right side of the driveway to the front door of the house, and tree protection.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. The project is not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for Materials (page 6.19), Sidewalks and Parking (page 8.2-8.30), and Fences and Walls (pages 8.6-8.8) with the exception of the boulders on the left side of the driveway.
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 the following conditions:
  - a. Work with Staff on a retaining wall on the left side of the driveway instead of boulders.
  - b. Expand upon submitted tree protection plan to include locations of tree protection fencing and protection zone distances and protection from construction debris around the trees.
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]:**

Ms. Walker, who had recused herself from the discussion of the application, offered evidence and comments against the proposed application. She stated that the boulders being used were incongruous with the historic district per Standard 8.4, numbers 6 and 9, that the driveway cutout as done bears no resemblance to the approved project, and that a tree protection plan had not been provided. Ms. Harpst informed Ms. Walker that a tree protection plan had already been provided by Heartwood.

**MOTION:      APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS      1<sup>st</sup>:      PARATI      2<sup>nd</sup>:      WOJICK**

Ms. Parati moved to approve the changes outlined in the application as they are not incongruous with the district and meets the Standards for materials, sidewalks, and parking in Standards 8.2 and 8.3, and fences and walls in Standards 8.6 through 8.8, with the exception of the boulders. She added that the applicant should work with Staff on the best way to deal with the grade change, whether that be via a retaining wall or ivy, but something other than boulders that would be in keeping with the context of the neighborhood. She also asked that the tree protection plan already submitted be expanded to include the location of all trees, and to mark those that are being protected. Ms. Wojick seconded the motion.

Mr. Barth offered an amendment that the applicants work with Staff in utilizing their arborist to find a way to mitigate potential damage that has been done to the root structure and to work on a plan for the health of that tree. Further, if that tree should fail in the next five years, the applicants should work with Staff to find an acceptable replacement, citing Standard 8.5. Ms. Wojick accepted the amendment.

**VOTE: 8/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, PARATI, TAYLOR, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR SITE WORK – APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**NOT HEARD AT THE JUNE 14 MEETING**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: WHEAT

ARRIVED: LINEBERGER

RETURNED: WALKER

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCMA-2023-00115, 1921 CHARLOTTE DR (PID: 12111901) – NEW CONSTRUCTION & ADDITION – NON-RESIDENTIAL**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The property is a 2-story office/multi-family building constructed in 1992. Architectural features include a complex roof form, a recessed off-center entry on Charlotte Drive, and two centrally located arched metal vents on the roof. Lot size measures approximately 128.55' x 164.46' x 144.09' x 180'. Adjacent structures are 1-, 1.5-, 2-story single family and 2-story multi-family and office buildings. A replacement retaining wall on the Ideal Way side and rear patio expansion were approved administratively under COA# HDCADMRM-2018-00518; parking, landscaping and site work were approved administratively under COA# HDCADMRM-2020-00416. The HDC approved the replacement of vinyl siding with cementitious board and batten siding, and entry door changes on the front and left elevations in June 2021 under COA# HDCRMI-2021-00149.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is new construction. An existing boutique hotel, the Kasa Edison House, will be expanded with the construction of a new building between the existing structure and Kenilworth Avenue. Proposed height is approximately 26'-0" as measured from grade to ridge. From Charlotte Drive, the height of the existing building is 26'-9 ¼" at the left and approximately 25'-11" on the right. The proposed building footprint is 97'-2" x 30'-0", slightly wider than the existing structure. Proposed materials are brick and cementitious board and batten siding to match the existing structure and metal railings. Window and door and trim materials are not noted. The project includes the removal of three (3) mature canopy trees.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Provide additional information about the new trees to be planted, including size and species.
2. Eave/cornice alignment, particularly on the Ideal Way elevation.
3. Is it possible to add additional fenestration on the Ideal Way elevation and parking lot elevation?
4. Provide specifications on proposed windows.
5. Provide material information about window trim.
6. The Commission has previously approved the installation of non-grain fiber cement siding in dimensions to



4. For the accessory structure, restudy the massing of the proposed structure particularly as it involves the structure's width as well as directional expression and how it relates to the primary historic structure on the property such that it responds to its architectural style, massing, and is clearly secondary to the primary structure. Per Standards 6.8, 6.9, and 8.10 number 3.
5. The Commission is not reviewing the details of the accessory structure until the next iteration of the project.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing 2-story Colonial Revival building was constructed c. 1938. Architectural features include a side gable roof with pent eaves, symmetrical façade, one-story side wings, a central entry with a broken pediment and pilaster surround, 6/1 double-hung wood windows, unpainted brick exterior, and a monumental full façade front porch with a flat roof supported by square fluted columns. The lot size is approximately 110' x 200'. Adjacent structures are 1, 2, and 2.5-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is in three parts:

1. Window Changes. On the right elevation, two (2) original window openings will be infilled, and two (2) new openings created. The bricks removed for the new openings be used to infill the original window openings. On the rear elevation, a single window will be expanded to a triple window.
2. Existing accessory structure will be demolished, and
3. New accessory structure constructed in the rear yard and a mature 21" Oak tree will be removed. Building footprint measures approximately 64'-8 1/2" x 24'-9". Proposed wall height is approximately 10' from finished floor. Proposed building height as measured from grade to ridge is not provided. Proposed exterior materials are 5/16" Hardie fiber cement siding with 4" Hardie corner boards. Soffit proposed as 1/4" Hardie panel. Fascia and freeze trim noted as Miratec. Entry doors proposed to be Kolbe Heritage Series. Windows proposed to be Kolbe Heritage Series Sterling double-hung wood windows with 5/8" muntins. Window trim/sill materials not specified and noted as being provided by window manufacturer. Garage door specifications not provided. Rear yard permeability calculations not provided.

*Revised Proposal*

- The accessory building proposal has been withdrawn.
- The original historic windows will be re-used on the right elevation of the main house. If the windows cannot be re-used then replica windows will be installed. The bricks removed for the new openings be used to infill the original window openings. See Sheet A6.
- New windows will be installed on either side of the existing historic window on the rear elevation of the main house. See Sheet A7.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Window changes on primary structure
  - a. Will trim and header/sill details match existing?
  - b. Mullion trim needed between triple window on the rear elevation.
  - c. Note that brick exterior is to remain unpainted.
  - d. Material specifications needed for new windows to be installed on rear elevation.
2. Confirm that the tree removal request and demolition of the existing accessory structure has also been withdrawn.
3. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:      APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS      1<sup>st</sup>:      WOJICK      2<sup>nd</sup>:      LINEBERGER**

Ms. Wojick moved to approve the application as it is not incongruous with the Design Standards. She noted that the window trim, headers, and sill of the masonry should match the existing when reinstalled and that the mullion trim matches the Standards on the triple window. Ms. Wojick added that the brick should remain unpainted and that the specifications for the new windows be reviewed by Staff. She clarified that the demolition of the existing accessory structure, the tree removal, and the construction of the new accessory structure are not being reviewed by the Commission at this time. Ms. Wojick cited Standard 5.5, number 4, and Standard 4.14, number 6. Ms. Lineberger seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 10/0**

**AYES: BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, TAYLOR, WALKER, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR WINDOW CHANGES - APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**CONTINUED FROM THE JUNE 14 MEETING**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: WHEAT

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCCMI-2023-00237, 420 W 5<sup>TH</sup> ST (PID: 07805308) – WINDOW CHANGES, DOOR CHANGES, & SITE WORK**

***This application was continued from the June 14, 2023 meeting for the following items:***

1. *Doors and Windows, per Design Standards for Windows, 4.14, and per Chapter 7, specifically 7.14 and 7.15:*
  - *Restudy the use of replacement windows, referencing Section 7.14, to mimic window details and typologies that are more in keeping with the architectural style and period of the structure.*
  - *If the intent is to replicate the historic photo on slide number 6 that the window proportions, mull gaps, and sizing be duplicated.*
2. *Brick, per Standard 4.4 and 5.5, number 6: brick to remain unpainted as expressed by the applicant and to utilize Staff on hand as far as cleaning and preserving any masonry on the structure.*
3. *Access Ramp, per 8.11: provide additional information with regard to the ramp being added at the rear of the property.*

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

Charlotte Fire Station Number 4 is a flat-roofed, three-bay, two-story unpainted brick building on West Fifth Street in Fourth Ward and adjacent to a high rise and mid-rise multi-family buildings. Windows are replacements. There is a small, shed roof addition on the rear. Lot size is approximately 60' x 168'.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is replacing non-original windows and doors, removing a small non-historic addition on the rear, the addition of an ADA-ramp at the rear, changing a window to a door on the rear elevation and installing non-permanent planters around an existing concrete apron in front of the building. Proposed windows are metal storefronts. New doors are proposed as aluminum.

*Revised Proposal*

- Brick cleaning, graffiti removal and repointing notes provided, see Sheet A6.0
- Access ramp details provided, see Sheet A9.0

- Replacement window design updated, see Sheet A12.1

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Minor changes may be approved by Staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:      APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS      1<sup>st</sup>:      BARTH      2<sup>nd</sup>:      WALKER**

Mr. Barth made a motion to approve the application as presented as it is not incongruous with the district and Design Standards. He added conditions that the applicant work with Staff to find an appropriate design specification for the proposed windows referencing Standard 4.14, Chapter 7 broadly, and Standards 7.14 and 7.15, specifically. He requested that the applicant work with Staff professionals regarding the masonry and that the masonry should remain unpainted and cleaned and preserved in a proper manner. He also directed the applicant to work with Staff on finding a way to attach the ramp that would be non-damaging to the historic structure. Mr. Barth referenced Standards 4.14 and 5.15, number 6 for this item. Chair Hawkins suggested they include Standard 8.11 for ramps. Ms. Walker seconded the motion.

**VOTE: 10/0**

**AYES:    BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER,  
PARATI, TAYLOR, WALKER, WHITLOCK, WOJICK**

**NAYS:    NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR WINDOW CHANGES, DOOR CHANGES, & SITE WORK - APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.**

---

**NEW CASES**

---

Before hearing new cases, the Commission discussed whether to rearrange the order of the agenda. Mr. Barth had a pending case, he was recused from this discussion and vote. There was a vote, 8 to 1, in favor of keeping the agenda order as initially planned.

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: WHEAT

RECUSED: TAYLOR

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2023-00256, 2310 Charlotte Dr (PID: 12112402) – ADDITION & WINDOW CHANGES**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Picturesque Revival building constructed c. 1925. Architectural features include a steeply pitched cross gable roof with a lower off-center gabled entry and hip roof dormer. The building is a side gable block with engaged partial width porch supported by brick piers and tapered columns with a projecting front gable section. The exterior material is wood lap siding with cornerboards, wood trim, 4/4 and 6/6 windows, gable end louvered vents, and an unpainted brick chimney and foundation. A one-story side porch has been converted to heated living space. The second level addition over the enclosed side porch was approved by the HDC under COA#



**NAYS: NONE**

**DECISION: APPLICATION FOR ADDITION & WINDOW CHANGES - CONTINUED.**

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: WHEAT

RETURNED: TAYLOR

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMI-2023-00282, 524 E KINGSTON AV (PID: 12308412) – ADDITION, WINDOW CHANGES, & DOOR CHANGES**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

The existing structure is a 1.5-story Bungalow built c. 1915. The building is a side gable block with engaged full width porch supported by tapered brick piers and square wood columns. A front gable dormer features three casement windows and wood shingle siding. The exterior material is wood lap siding with corner boards on the first level and wood shingle siding on the second level. The central, multipaned entry door is flanked by large 24/1 windows, all of which appear to be original. The deep eaves are supported by brackets. The accessory structure was previously approved under COA# HDCADMRM-2021-00650. The lot size measures approximately 50' x 140'. Adjacent structures are a mixture of 1.5 and 2-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is the removal of an existing deck and a new rear addition. A former rear addition will be reconfigured and expanded on both the first and second levels. The ridge will tie in below the primary ridge. A vertical piece of trim at the rear corners of the original house will indicate the transition between the original house and the addition. Proposed materials are shake shingle siding and wood lap siding to match existing. The trim band between the first and second levels will also be extended on all sides of the addition. Proposed new windows are Kolbe Ultra series, double-hung and casement. Post-construction the rear yard impervious area will be 30%. There are also some minor changes on the front, left and right elevations of the original structure.

*Front elevation:* The only visible change is the extension of an existing masonry chimney to meet code requirements.

*Left elevation:* On the first level a double-hung window will be relocated. On the second level, a ganged set of non-original windows will be removed and replaced with individual shake shingles to match existing.

*Right Elevation:* The original eave line will be restored. An existing double hung window will be relocated closer to the rear corner of the house.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Window trim detail needed.
2. Deck railing detail needed.
3. New brick needs noted to remain unpainted.
4. HVAC location?
5. Is it possible to bump the addition in on the right elevation a few inches?

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**

No one accepted Chair Hawkins' invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:**      **APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS**      **1<sup>st</sup>:**      **BARTH**      **2<sup>nd</sup>:**      **BELL**

Mr. Barth made a motion to approve the application as presented as it is not incongruous with the districts or Design Standards, adding the following conditions: that the triple-ganged windows on the right elevation second-story shed dormer be considered as a slightly larger window to improve the sill to roof relationship and help maintain the unique character of the A-line windows seen on the house and that the applicant add an additional window towards the rear on the lower level. He articulated the Commission's preference to leave the window uncovered but acknowledged that that would be an interior change not under the Commission's review. He cited Standards 6.15 and 6.16. Mr. Barth also added that the applicant should work with Staff on window trim detailing, that the brick should remain unpainted, and that the HVAC should be screened. Ms. Bell seconded the motion.

**VOTE:** 10/0

**AYES:** BARTH, BELL, GOODWIN, HAWKINS, LINEBERGER, PARATI, TAYLOR, WALKER, WHITLOCK, WOJICK

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR ADDITION, WINDOW CHANGES, & DOOR CHANGES - APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING | RETURNED:**

ABSENT: WHEAT

**APPLICATION:**

**HDCRMA-2023-00321, 820 WOODRUFF PL (PID: 07103501) – ACCESSORY BUILDING**

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**

Known as the Gibson House, the existing 2-story Colonial Revival building was constructed c. 1941. Architectural features include symmetrical façade with a hip roof. The exterior is painted brick with quoin details at the corners, a large brick chimney on the left elevation and a brick soldier course band under the second level windows. The second story has a round window in the center bay and 6/6 windows in end bays which extend above the roofline and are treated as dormers above the eaves. Neither the front porch nor the one-story side addition are historic. The lot size is irregular measuring approximately 82' x 219' x 73' x 102' x 32' x 150'. Adjacent structures are 1, and 1.5-story residential buildings.

**PROPOSAL:**

The proposed project is the construction of a new accessory structure in the rear yard. Proposed height as measured from finished floor to ridge is approximately 21'-11½". Foundation height is not provided, and total height as measured from grade to ridge is not provided. Building footprint measurements are not provided. Proposed exterior siding material is lap siding and corner boards to match the main house. No information provided about proposed doors and windows or trim. Post-construction the rear yard will be 24% impervious surfaces.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**

Staff has the following comments about the proposal:

1. Massing, height, width, and size.
2. Total height as measured from grade to ridge needed.

