



HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION

January 15, 2020

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mr. Jim Haden (Chairperson)
Ms. Kim Parati (Vice Chairperson)
Ms. Jessica Hindman (2nd Vice Chairperson)
Mr. P.J. Henningson
Mr. Jim Jordan
Mr. Chris Muryn
Mr. Damon Rumsch
Ms. Jill Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT: Ms. Christa Lineberger
Mr. John Phares
Mr. Chris Barth

OTHERS PRESENT: Ms. Kristi Harpst, Administrator of the Historic District
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. Andrea Leslie-Fite, Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

The Commission held a pre-meeting workshop to review and vote on changes to the Rules for Procedure to incorporate a “Designation Process for New Local Historic Districts.” Commissioner Hindman made a motion to Approve the “Designation Process” with Commissioner Rumsch seconding the motion. The Board passed the motion unanimously with a vote of 8-0.

With a quorum present, Chairman Haden called the regular January meeting of the Historic District Commission (Commission) meeting to order at 1:03 pm. He 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 Guidelines**. 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 a 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. Chairman Haden asked that everyone please turn to silent operation any electronic devices. Commissioners are asked to announce, for the record, if one leaves or arrives during the meeting. Chairman Haden said that those in the audience must be quiet during the hearings. An audience member will be asked once to be quiet and the need for a second request will be removal from the room. Chairman Haden swore in all Applicants and Staff and continued to swear in people as they arrived for the duration of the meeting. Appeal from the Historic District Commission is to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. One has thirty (30) days from the date of the decision to appeal. This is in accordance with Section 10.213 of the City Zoning Ordinance.

Index of Addresses:

Not Heard in December 11, 2019

HDCRMA 2019-00748, 201 Grandin Road	Wesley Heights
HDCRMI 2019-00601, 2224 Sarah Marks Avenue	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2019-00585, 1640 Dilworth Road E	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2019-00570, 1907 S Mint Street	Wilmore

Continued

HDCRMI 2019-00617, 2007 Dilworth Road E	Dilworth
HDCRMA 2019-00154, 629 S Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights
HDCRMI 2019-00671, 407 Hermitage Court	Hermitage Court
HDCRMA 2019-00588, 612 S Summit Avenue	Wesley Heights

New Cases

HDCRMI 2019-00726, 2015 Dilworth Road E	Dilworth
HDCRMI 2019-00729, 1716 Merriman Avenue	Wilmore
HDCRMI 2019-00675, 404 E Worthington Avenue	Dilworth
HDCADMRRM 2019-00387, 404 West Boulevard	Wilmore
HDCADMRRM 2019-00564, 1913 The Plaza	Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI 2019-00783, 1545 Wilmore Drive	Wilmore

NOT HEARD IN DECEMBER

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINERGER, PHARES

APPLICATION: HDCRMA 2019-00748, 201 GRANDIN ROAD - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a Romanesque Revival church designed by renowned Charlotte architect Louis Asbury and constructed in 1928. The “T” shaped building contains both sanctuary and offices. The Church section has a gable facing Grandin Road. Notable architectural features include the triple entry with marbled windows, brick with crenellations, pilasters and corbelling details, cast stone trim, and arched, marbled windows. The property also includes a 1.5 story brick rectory constructed c. 1940. The rectory is an American Small House with Tudor and Colonial Revival details. Adjacent structures 1, 1.5 and 2-story single family residential buildings and 2-3-story multi-family townhomes. The lot size is approximately 108’ x 187.5’. The parcel is zoned MUDD(CD).

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is the conversion of a former church into condominiums. No changes are proposed to the front elevation. The only proposed change to the rear elevation is to add windows on the basement level in dimensions and configuration to match existing; proposed material is aluminum clad. On the right (courtyard) elevation the windows on the basement level will be changed to aluminum clad patio doors. A single-entry door will be removed and bricked in to match existing. The stained-glass windows will be removed, and the openings enlarged. The left (W. 4th St) elevation also includes the removal of all stained-glass windows and enlarging the openings. Portions of the windows are proposed to be re-used in the entry doors. Brick steps and partition walls will provide access and separation between the units. An addition will be constructed on the courtyard side of the building behind the existing parsonage. Proposed materials are brick to match existing and aluminum clad Simulated True Divided Light (STD L) windows and doors.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Primary concern: loss of all original, character-defining stained-glass windows on both the left and right elevations. A design solution to keep at least one elevation largely intact would be more suitable.
2. Left Elevation:
 - a. Loss of original windows. Consider a re-design that keeps the original windows.
 - b. Single entry door is shown to remain on the Axon view but is removed in the elevations. If removed, will the cast concrete detail be replicated?
3. Right Elevation:
 - a. Unique solution to re-use stained glass windows in the entry doors.
 - b. Brick partition wall design
4. Addition:
 - a. Label size (footprint and height dimensions) on plans.
 - b. Wood railings appear incongruous with the structure.
 - c. Label tree species and size on the site plan for both trees proposed for removal and new trees to be planted.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

Mr. Ben Fore, neighborhood resident, spoke in favor of this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: PARATI 2nd: WALKER

Ms. Parati moved to continue this application for a restudy of the windows and the preservation and retaining them in the current position. Guidelines 4.14 #1. Ms. Parati noted that the commission did not discuss anything else about this application.

- Mr. Henningson friendly amendment Guidelines 4.14,
- #1 Retain and preserve existing windows
 - #2 Repair the existing windows
 - #3 Replace window only if it is beyond repair
 - #5 Retain the glass screen on the windows
 - #6 Avoid adding or changing the window openings

Ms. Hindman friendly amendment, federal guidelines 2.5, #1 placed in new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, JORDAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR AN ADDITION CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, PHARES

APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00601, 2224 SARAH MARKS AVENUE – ADDITION/ACCESSORY BUILDING

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The building is a 1.5 story Craftsman bungalow constructed in 1922. Architectural features include deep eaves with exposed rafters and oversize brackets, a large picture window on the front elevation, 6/1 wood windows, and shake siding. A single-car concrete block garage structure is located at the rear left corner of the lot. The lot size is approximately 50' x 87'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5 and 2-story single family houses.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project includes re-opening the enclosed front porch and reconstructing the original columns, a rear addition, renovations to the existing historic garage structure, and a new driveway gate. Proposed materials are brick foundation, wood shake siding and trim to match existing, and double-hung windows with Simulated True Divided Lights (STD L) in a 6/1 pattern to match existing. Post-construction the rear-yard permeable area will be 79%. There are no impacts to mature canopy trees. The Zoning Board of Adjustment (ZBA) granted a variance for both the rear yard and side yard, see attached minutes and letter. The NC Historic Preservation Office (HPO) is reviewing the project for tax credits.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Lot size constraints do not allow for a substantive one-story rear addition.
2. The addition is clearly distinguished from the original house.
3. Driveway + driveway gate orientation.
4. Rear yard fence may be reviewed by staff.
5. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

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

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application, because it meets the following, the porch restoration is approved. The addition is approved with staff to review the construction documents for details. The unusual site constraints require height and footprint coverage allowances. The garage, and driveway gate are approved but must be located one full car length beyond the front thermal wall of the house in the spirit and intent of guideline 8.2, #6

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, JORDAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION AND ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, PHARES

APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00585, 1640 DILWORTH ROAD E – ACCESSORY BUILDING

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 2.5 story brick Colonial Revival, with Tudor Revival elements, constructed in 1930. Architectural features include an asymmetrical sloped gable entry, one-story side porch (now enclosed), and 6/6 double-hung windows with a keystone header detail. The lot size is an irregular pie shape measuring 171 x 177 x 71 x 88. The former garage structure was approved for removal the Administrative level in 2015.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is a new one-story accessory building with a footprint of 24' x 24' and an overall height of 21.2'. A breezeway roof will connect the garage to a former rear addition on the primary structure. The lot currently has two curb cuts and driveway entrances, one off Dilworth Road East and one off Isleworth Avenue. Per zoning, the front yard faces Dilworth Road East. Proposed materials are brick to match the house, wood garage doors, wood or composite trim to match existing, and double-hung windows with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL) in a 6/6 pattern to match existing. The project also includes the removal of concrete in the side yard adjacent to Dilworth Road East, rebuilding the berm and replanting grass. There are no impacts to mature canopy trees; ornamental trees may have to be removed to construct the garage.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. The unique shape of the lot provides challenges for locating the garage to meet all HDC requirements. If the garage is pushed to the corner, it will be partially located in the side yard.
2. Replanting ornamental trees to screen the breezeway, and as a separation between the garage and the single-family residential house at 1029 Isleworth.
3. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: HENNINGSON **2nd:** RUMSCH

Mr. Henningson moved to continue this application for a site plan that shows the neighbor on the Isleworth side to ensure that the garage is not forward of the neighbor's house, per guideline 8.9, #2. Because of the site constraints, consider moving the garage further back into the rear yard to avoid side yard parking.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment to get rid of breezeway because its implicit to the motion and it does not tie to a guideline.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, JORDAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY BUILDING CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, PHARES

APPLICATION: HDCRMA 2019-00570, 1907 S MINT STREET – PAINTED BRICK

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The building is a one-story brick American Small House with Colonial Revival elements constructed in 1946. Architectural features include lap siding with a scallop detail in the front gable, a partial-width front porch with a shed roof supported by square columns, and 6/1 windows. The lot size is approximately 50' x 120'.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is to paint the house.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Mortar repairs were made with cement, which is also spread over some areas of brick, which was completed by a previous owner.
2. The front porch foundation was completely painted, and portions of brick and mortar on the house were partially painted prior to the current owner purchasing the building.
3. The Commission shall determine if an exception shall be granted for the painted brick based on the evidence provided.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED

1st: RUMSCH 2nd: HINDMAN

Mr. Rumsch moved to approve the masonry painting because the document provided shows the project meets the guidelines for masonry, 5.5, #3 and the preamble 5.8. We are making an exception to our guidelines because the brick is already painted, and it is not the applicant's fault.

VOTE: 8/0

AYES: HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, JORDAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR PAINTED MASONRY APPROVED.

CONTINUED

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, PHARES

APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00617, 2007 DILWORTH ROAD E – ADDITION

The application was continued from December for the following items:

- *Restudy of the front dormer size and pitch*
- *Bring the front wall of the dormer off the front thermal wall of the first floor*
- *Restudy of the four-inch inset of the addition roof line as visible from the front elevation and the right elevation*
- *Provide detailing of trim in the areas of wood siding*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Known as the Hutchinson House, the one-story Colonial Revival house was constructed in 1925. Architectural features include a shed roof one-bay portico supported by paired columns, a one-story hip roof side wing, wood shutters, fan light over the front door, and 6/1 double-hung wood windows. Except for the foundation, the house is painted brick. Existing ridge height is 21'-9". The lot size is approximately 60' x 144'.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is a front and rear dormer additions, deck addition, and design changes to the existing front portico. The front dormer and rear dormer additions have an overall proposed ridge height is 23'-11". An open porch on the rear will be partially enclosed in a design to match the paneled side wing. The existing rear landing will be expanded into a wood deck with new access stairs to the rear yard. The existing double-hung windows in the gable ends will be replaced with new double-hung windows to match those on the first level. New windows will be either double-hung or casement with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL) in a 6/1 pattern to match existing. The front portico roof and cornice will be changed, all other elements of the existing front portico will remain the same. Proposed materials of the additions are wood lap siding and trim to match existing. A new wood front door is also proposed. No changes to the rear yard impermeable area. There are no impacts to mature canopy trees.

Revised Proposal – January 15, 2020

- Front dormer design revised to be off the front thermal wall, smaller in size, and an increased roof pitch from 2/12 to 3/12.
- Proposed ridge height changed from 23'-11" to 24'-5".
- Off-set increased and highlighted on New Proposed Front Elevation and New Proposed Rear Elevation
- Window trim detail provided

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Additions, 7.2.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: APPROVED

1st: HINDMAN 2nd: RUMSCH

Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application because it meets all the requirements from the December’s continuance and the application meets 7.2 for additions.

VOTE: 6/2

AYES: HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, MURYN, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: PARATI, JORDAN

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, PHARES
MS. HINDMAN RECUSED HERSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: HDCRMA 2019-00154, 629 S. SUMMIT AVENUE – ADDITION

The application was continued from December for the following items:

Guideline 7.2, numbers 1 and 2.

- *Location of the carport in the back with the addition taller than the existing house makes the addition visually overpower the existing building.*
- *Ensure window detail on the addition matches the original trim, light pattern, etc. and is consistent.*

7.2, number 6. The addition needs to be compatible with the existing house and match its simplicity.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Constructed in 1931, the one-story frame Craftsman bungalow has a basic rectangular mass with a front-facing clipped gable roof. The full-length front porch has an identical clipped gable roof, knee braces, a decorative window and gable vent, and square brick columns. Other architectural features include exposed rafters, 4/1 double-hung wood windows, and brick foundation. Siding and window trim are wrapped in vinyl/aluminum siding. Existing ridge height is 19'-6". The lot size is approximately 55' x 190'.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is for a rear addition and carport addition. The proposed ridge height is 23'-6" and located approximately 60.5' back from the front thermal wall of the house. To provide a transition from the original house the addition bumps out on both the left and right side. Proposed materials are brick foundation to match existing, Hardie Artisan lap siding and trim in dimensions to match existing, and metal roofs on the shed dormers. New windows will be either double-hung or casement with Simulated True Divided Lights (STD L) in a 4/1 pattern to match existing. No changes proposed to the original house, except for the vinyl/aluminum siding will be removed and the original wood siding repaired. Post-construction the rear-yard impermeable area will be 36%. There are no impacts to mature canopy trees.

Revised Proposal – January 15, 2020

- Revised windows to match existing 4/1 light pattern.
- Shed dormer roof material changed from metal to asphalt shingle to match existing house.
- Rear porch design simplified, elimination of a column and change from brick to wood columns.
- Proposed Left Elevation B – relocates the carport to be closer to the front of the house
- Proposed Left Elevation C – removes the carport

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Proposed Left Elevation C, appears to meet the Guidelines for Additions, 7.2 #1, 3, 4, 5, and 7 and is similar to a recently approved rear addition at 719 E. Tremont.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS 1st: PARATI 2nd: RUMSCH

Ms. Parati moved to approve this application, because the applicant has met all the requirements for the continuation with option C and the application meets 7.2 of the guidelines for additions.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: HADEN, HENNINGSON, MURYN, JORDAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, PHARES

MR. MURYN LEFT THE MEETING AT 3:48 AND WAS ABSENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.

MS. HINDMAN RETURNED TO THE MEETING AT 3:47.

MR. JORDAN RECUSED HIMSELF FROM THE NEXT APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00671, 407 HERMITAGE COURT – ADDITION

The application was continued from December for the following items:

- 7.2, number 6. Re-study the addition with particular attention to the roof forms and windows.
- 6.16. All features of the addition should reflect the architecture of the original house, as outlined in the New Construction Checklist on page 6.16.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing historic building is a 2-story Dutch Colonial constructed in 1925. Architectural features include a central entry portico supported by oversize brackets, a central front door with sidelights and fanlight, 6/6 double-hung wood windows with operable wood shutters, and wood lap siding with wood corner boards. The house eaves have a unique decorative corbel detail. The lot size is approximately 60' x 181'. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2-story single family residences.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is a two-story rear addition that will tie in beneath the existing ridge. The addition increases the size of the existing house more than 50%. The addition footprint is +/- 21'-6" x 32'-4". Proposed materials are brick foundation, wood lap siding and trim to match existing, and double-hung windows with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL) in a 6/6 pattern to match existing. Post-construction the rear yard impermeable area will be 28%. There are no impacts to mature canopy trees.

Revised Proposal – January 15, 2020

1. Roof forms changed from hip to gambrel.
2. On left elevation, windows changed from transoms to a paired upper sash (second level, bathroom) and to a double window on the first level.
3. Adjusted window sizes on rear elevation.
4. Brackets on the addition have been revised to be smaller versions of those on the front elevation.
5. Removed trim band on addition.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Overall, the proposal is not incongruous with the District and meets the guidelines for Additions, 7.2.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED

1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: HINDMAN

Mr. Henningson moved to approve this application based on guideline 7.2 for additions and that the project is not incongruous with the neighborhood.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, PHARES, MURYN

MR. JORDAN RETURNED TO THE MEETING AT 3:55 PM. MS. PARATI RECUSED HERSELF FOR THE NEXT APPLICATION.

APPLICATION: HDCRMA 2019-00588, 612 S SUMMIT AVENUE – NEW CONSTRUCTION

The application was continued from December for the following items:

- *Fenestration 6.12, item 1(a)*
- *6.10, item 2*
- *4.5, item 3 (dormers)*
- *6.5, Massing*
- *6.9, Foundation*
- *6.14, porch railings*
- *6.11 rear door trim and roof soffits*
- *6.10, item 3 and 5, and 2/12 roof slopes and materials*
- *Retaining wall details needed*

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Known as the Gantt House, the main building is a 1-story bungalow, with Craftsman and Colonial Revival elements, constructed c. 1926 according to the National Register listing. A portico and porch combination shields two of the three facade bays of this small frame dwelling. One story high, it has a hipped roof crossed by clipped gables on the sides. The slightly off-center front entry has sidelights which coordinate with the 4/1 sash windows on the facade. The house is currently wrapped in vinyl siding. Adjacent structures are 1, 1.5, and 2 story single family homes. The lot size is 50' x 197.5'. House height is 22.8'. Demolition was approved with a 365-day delay on February 13, 2019 (HDC 2019-00039).

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is new construction of a single-family structure and the rehabilitation of the existing accessory building.

The new single-family structure will be sited in approximately the same location as the current house. The front porch begins at approximately 38' and the existing house front porch begins at 39.4'. The proposed height of the new structure is 26'-10 7/16". Proposed materials include Hardie Artisan siding, wood trim, and aluminum clad windows.

An existing two-story accessory structure is proposed for rehabilitation. Work includes removal of the dilapidated entrance stair and replacement with a new stair that meets code requirements. Replacing all double-hung wood windows with new single-hung aluminum clad windows. Removal of the vinyl/aluminum wrap and the original siding and trim beneath the wrap. The installation of new Hardie Artisan siding and wood trim. Reconfiguring the garage door locations.

Revised Proposal – December 11

New Construction

- Ridge height 26'-6 7/16"
- Roof pitches labeled
- Revised elevation drawings include re-designed rear dormer
- Beam-column detail provided

Accessory Building

- Windows to be repaired and revised project drawings to be submitted to staff for review.

Revised Proposal – January 15, 2020

- Front dormer changed from 7/12 gable roof to a 2/12 shed roof.
- Front dormer windows changed from two to three and increased in size.
- Rear dormer window changed from single to paired.
- Retaining wall removed.
- Corner board trim dimensions provided.
- Cedar shake dimensions and application method provided.
- Windows noted to be double-hung.
- Rear door trim casing design revised.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Massing, directional expression, height and foundation (items appear unchanged from the December proposal).
 - a. Massing. The house on the right is not a Bungalow, it is a Colonial Revival house with a steeply pitched roof and a completely different type and style from the proposed new construction.
 - b. Directional Expression. Bungalows are typically more rectangular than square, and as proposed, the directional expression is square.
 - c. The floor level of the foundation and front porch do not align with the houses on the street.
 - d. The level of the windows on first floor do not align with first floor windows on neighboring houses. While it is understood that the windows on the current house do not, the current house is being demolished; all new construction shall to be built in accordance with the guidelines and required to come into compliance.
2. Front dormer changed from a 7/12 gable roof to a 2/12 shed roof, and a larger triple window was added. Dormers typically have windows proportionally smaller than the windows on the main portion of the house.
3. Rear dormer – single windows changed to paired windows. The paired windows in the dormer are larger than the paired windows on the first level. Dormers typically have windows proportionally smaller than the windows on the main portion of the house.
4. Roofs – front porch roof, front dormer, and rear dormer roofs all have 2/12 pitches, which is incongruous with the Bungalow style architecture.
 - a. Eave overhangs on dormer are too shallow and do not match the Bungalow style. Shed roof dormers typically have exposed rafters and/or brackets.
5. Cornices, trim, and eave materials and dimensions need to be noted (ex: soffit, window/door trim material)
 - a. Will eaves be closed or open?
 - b. V-groove soffit?
 - c. Confirm no pork chop eaves.
 - d. Window and door trim material need specified.
6. Porches:

- a. Front railing height/relationship between rail height and windows. Historically, the top rail on a porch railing was approximately equal to the height of the window sills. While the booster rail concept is moving the in the right direction, the relationship between the rail and windows may need to be revisited. Or additional information about the dimensions might be needed to clarify how it will look when built.
- b. Design of rail down front steps. Due to the long expanse, at least one support post will be needed mid-way which is not indicated on the drawings. Recommended: Front porch handrail down front steps to be a simple metal rail that disappears and does not distract from the house.

7. Doors and Windows:

- a. Fenestration on right elevation.
- b. Window muntin size.
- c. Rear door casing appears to be too narrow.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: RUMSCH 2nd: HINDMAN

Mr. Rumsch moved to continue this application for the same as the December’s continuance except for the roof soffits, and retaining wall.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.

NEW CASES

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, PHARES, MURYN
 MS. PARATI RETURNED TO THE MEETING AT 4:29.

APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00726, 2015 DILWORTH ROAD E - ADDITION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a two-story Dutch Colonial Revival house constructed in 1926. Architectural features include a symmetrical, three-bay front façade, 8/8 and 6/6 double-hung wood windows with functional shutters, and a small engaged arched portico above the front door. The first story and chimney are unpainted brick and, with the exception of the original round wood columns, all wood features on the house (siding, trim, etc.) are wrapped in vinyl and aluminum. The original one-story side porch located on the left elevation has been screened since prior to Dilworth’s designation a local historic district.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is the addition of a full-width front porch and the enclosure of an existing side porch on the left elevation.

Front porch: floor proposed to be bluestone with brick rowlock; 10” square Miratec columns. Size to be 36’-11” wide and 8’ deep. A new 5’ wide walkway connecting the new front porch to the existing driveway is also proposed.

Side porch: No change to footprint and brick foundation to remain. New flooring, replacement roof to match existing. New 10" square Miratec columns to replace the original round wood columns. Windows are wood with exterior muntins. Hardie tongue and groove siding proposed.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

Front Porch:

1. Setbacks of neighboring porches are not shown on the site plan.
2. Slope of existing roof? Does proposed front porch roof at a 3.5/12 pitch match existing?
3. Additional clarification need on how the new porch roof ties-in/impacts the existing roofline of the house?
4. Bluestone front porch material. Installation of bluestone on a front porch and front steps was recently denied for 1915 Ewing by the HDC on May 8, 2019.
 - a. Traditional material would be broken terracotta or concrete with a brick row-lock.
5. Existing siding is wrapped with vinyl/aluminum. New siding on ends of porch roof is proposed to be vinyl/aluminum to match existing.
6. Metal roof proposed for front porch portico.

Side Porch:

7. Clarification on proposed siding for side porch. Staff is unfamiliar with 'Hardie T&G Siding.' Will siding be mitered or have corner boards?
8. Window and trim details for side porch.

Both Porches:

9. Existing columns on both the side porch and front portico are round. Changing to a square design is not in keeping with the original architecture of the house.
10. Section drawing needed for both side porch and front porch.

Walkways:

11. Will existing secondary walk from front door to side porch be removed?
12. Width of new walkway connecting the front porch to the driveway is 5' which is the same size as the main walkway and as such does not appear to be secondary.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED

1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: JORDAN

Mr. Henningson moved to continue this application for a restudy on the front porches on Dutch Colonials. Per guideline 6.2, provide more information on setbacks. Per guideline 6.15, materials, use historic materials for the siding, front porch, and the steps that includes bluestone. The side porch use round columns per guideline 6.2, #6. Restudy the fenestration of the windows on the side porch. Provide information on what is under the vinyl and aluminum siding. All walkways to be reviewed by staff.

VOTE: 7/0

AYES: HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, PARATI, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ADDITION CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, PHARES, MURYN

MS. PARATI LEFT THE MEETING AT 5:11 PM AND WAS ABSENT FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MEETING.

APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00729, 1716 MERRIMAN AVENUE – WINDOW REPLACEMENT

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The existing structure is a 1-story American Small House with Craftsman elements constructed in 1928. Architectural features include exposed rafters, 6/1 wood windows, an engaged front porch supported by square wood columns, wood vent details, and a brick chimney. The lot size is approximately 50' x 118'. A rear addition was approved by the Commission on July 10, 2019, COA# HDCRMA-2019-000299.

PROPOSAL:

The proposed project is to replace the original wood windows with new wood windows.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. Is this a sash-kit only replacement? Will the existing wood trim on the windows be repaired or replaced?
2. The Commission will determine if the proposed replacement window and trim, where required, meet the Guidelines.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: DENIED

1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: RUMSCH

Mr. Henningson moved to deny this application based on guideline 4.14, #1, retain and preserve the original windows, #2 repair damaged windows, #3 replace only when it is beyond repair. There's insufficient evidence showing the windows are beyond repair.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, JORDAN, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR WINDOW REPLACEMENT DENIED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, PHARES, MURYN, PARATI

APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00675, 404 E WORTHINGTON AVENUE – TREE REMOVAL

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Known as the R. L. Bartley house, the 1.5 story Bungalow is described in the Dilworth National Register Nomination as "awkwardly designed with broad, low front gable block with low gable to one side, broad nearly full facade gabled porch and principle gable projects at the center to engage a two-bay porch, now enclosed. Half-story is shingled, as are gable ends and porch." The lot size is approximately 60' x 140'. There is a carriage track driveway located to the left of the house and a 10' alley in the rear.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal to remove a tree to allow for the construction of a new Garage/Accessory Dwelling Unit in the rear yard. The Garage/ADU may be staff reviewed since 404 E. Worthington is an interior lot and the structure will be accessed from the rear alley. According to a Certified Arborist the tree is an 80’ tall Water Oak in good health. The Water Oak is located in the center of the yard. A new maturing canopy tree is proposed as a replacement tree.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. The Commission shall determine if the tree should be removed and a new tree(s) planted.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

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

MOTION: DENIED

1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: WALKER

Mr. Henningson moved to deny this application based on guideline 8.5, #1 retain existing trees that define the district’s character. This tree is a healthy 80-foot canopy tree that is a major character-defining feature of the neighborhood.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL DENIED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, PHARES, MURYN, PARATI

APPLICATION: HDCADMRM 2019-00387, 404 WEST BOULEVARD – TREE REMOVAL

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

The structure is a 1.5 story side-gabled brick bungalow constructed c. 1933. Architectural features include a symmetrical facade with a central entry, 4/1 paired windows, and original wood front door. The partial width front porch has a central gabled portico supported by brick piers and columns. The lot size is approximately 50’ x 150’. There is a concrete driveway located to the right of the house and parking in the rear.

A pair of mature trees used to flank the front walkway and were removed without prior approval in late 2018. The property owner provided photographs of one of the trees showing decay as verified by Urban Forestry staff and retroactively approved for removal with replanting required by staff, COA# HDCADMRM-2019-00387.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal to remove a tree in the front yard and replace it with an Overcup Oak tree approximately 2-3” caliper. The property owner does not have photographs or an arborist report for the second tree. Email documentation from the property management company is attached.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. The Commission shall determine if the tree should be removed and any remedy and replanting requirements.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak either for or against this application

MOTION: DENIED

1st: HINDMAN 2nd: RUMSCH

Ms. Hindman moved to deny this application for the removal of the second tree, because it does not meet the following guidelines: 8.5, #1, nor is it in compliance with 8.5 #2 and the recommended replacement meets guidelines 8.5, #6. The recommended replacement of one additional canopy tree in the front yard to replace the second tree left as viewed from the street. One canopy tree at the back corner behind the accessory building to replenish the canopy and two ornamental trees at the front yard to discourage front yard parking.

VOTE: 5/1

AYES: HADEN, HINDMAN, HENNINGSON, JORDAN, RUMSCH

NAYS: WALKER

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR TREE REMOVAL DENIED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:

ABSENT: BARTH, LINEBERGER, PHARES, MURYN, PARATI

APPLICATION: HDCADMRM 2019-00564, 1913 THE PLAZA – ALTERNATE MATERIALS

EXISTING CONDITIONS:

Known as the Hutchinson House, the two-story American Four Square with colonial revival elements built c. 1930. Architectural features include a partial width front porch with the center portion covered by a portico, original front door sidelights, and 6/1 paired windows. The carport and decorative moldings above the front door and first floor windows are later additions. The house is painted brick and has been since before the district was established. The lot size is approximately 66' x 170'.

PROPOSAL:

The proposal is for a non-traditional mechanized screen system on a rear porch. The system is proposed to be integrated with the beams and the columns. Other than the request for the mechanized screen system, the other changes to the rear porch meet the requirements to be reviewed at the Administrative level. No changes to the rear yard impermeable area. There are no impacts to mature canopy trees.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff has the following concerns with the proposal:

1. The changes to the existing rear porch are approvable at the Administrative level.
2. The screen system is a unique solution to a three-season room, which has not yet been evaluated by the Commission.
3. Rather than integrating the system with the columns and the beam, which results in a visible track, a better solution would be to install the equipment on the interior of the beams and to the rear of the columns so as to not be visible from the exterior. If installed on the interior, the system is more easily reversible with a much lesser impact to the overall porch design and would be in accordance with applicable Secretary of the Interiors Standards 9 and 10.
4. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:

No one accepted Mr. Haden's invitation to speak for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED

1st: JORDAN 2nd: HINDMAN

Mr. Jordan moved to approve this application because it meets the Secretary of Interior Standards for rehabilitation and guideline, page 2.5.

Ms. Hindman added that this project is a new porch and not an old porch. We are not discussing modifying historic columns. This is a very thoughtful solution to preserving the character of the district. If this were an old porch, we would be having a totally different conversation.

VOTE: 6/0

AYES: HADEN, HENNINGSON, HINDMAN, JORDAN, RUMSCH, WALKER

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:

APPLICATION FOR ALTERNATE MATERIALS APPROVED.

APPLICATION: HDCRMI 2019-00783, 1545 WILMORE DRIVE – ROOF REPLACEMENT

Applicants deferred to next meeting.

MR. HADEN ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 6:29 PM.

LINDA KEICH
CLERK TO THE BOARD