HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION REMOTE ONLINE MEETING
Meeting August 12, 2020, ROOM 267 + WebEx

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT:  Ms. Kim Parati (Chairperson)
Mr. PJ Henningson (Vice Chairperson)
Ms. Jessica Hindman (2nd Vice Chairperson)
Mr. Chris Barth
Ms. Nichelle Bonaparte
Mr. Jim Haden
Ms. Christa Lineberger

MEMBERS ABSENT:  Mr. Jim Jordan
Mr. Chris Muryn
Mr. Damon Rumsch
Ms. Jill Walker

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, Senior Assistant City Attorney
Ms. Candy Thomas, Court Reporter

With a quorum present, Chairperson Parati called the August 12th Remote Online Historic District Commission Meeting to order at 1:09 pm. 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 hybrid 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 Guidelines. 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, please turn off or silent electronic devices and do not speak over the person talking or you will be asked to leave the meeting, use the “raise your hand” tool. 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. When it is your turn to speak, please begin by stating your 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 ADDRESSES:

CONTINUED FEBRUARY 12, 2020
HDCRMI 2019-00823, 821 Walnut Avenue Wesley Heights

CONTINUED MARCH 11, 2020
HDCADMRM 2019-00738, 1223 Belgrave Place Dilworth
HDCRMA 2019-00748, 201 Grandin Road Wesley Heights
HDCRMI 2020-00099, 1547 Merriman Avenue Wilmore

CONTINUED JULY 8, 2020
HDCRMI 2019-00746, 1911 S. Mint Street Wilmore
HDCRMI 2020-00107, 601 W. Kingston Avenue Wilmore
HDCCMI 2020-00124, 215 E. Worthington Avenue Dilworth
HDCRMA 2020-00156, 1424 Euclid Avenue Dilworth

NEW CASES
HDCRMI 2020-00387, 209 S. Summit Avenue Wesley Heights
HDCCMA 2019-00827, 1316 Thomas Avenue Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI 2020-00386, 1539 Merriman Avenue Wilmore
HDCRMI 2020-00196, 1308 Lexington Avenue Wilmore
HDCRMI 2020-00217, 1804 Thomas Avenue Plaza Midwood
HDCRMI 2020-00226, 251 W. Kingston Avenue Wilmore

CONTINUED
APPLICATION:
HDCRMI 2019-00823, 821 Walnut Avenue, (PID 07102223) – Tree Removal

Applicant deferred to next meeting.

APPLICATION:
HDCRMA 2019-00748, 201 GRANDIN ROAD, (PID 07101508) – ADDITION/FENESTRATION CHANGES

This application was continued from the March 11, 2020 meeting for the following items:

Re-study the window changes preservation and retention of the windows in the position currently in per the following Guidelines:

- 4.14, number 1. Retain and preserve windows
- 4.14, number 2. Repair existing, original windows
- 4.14, number 3. Replace window features only when beyond repair
- 4.14, number 5. Retain glass screen/shutter the backside of window
- 4.14, number 6. Avoid adding or changing window openings.
- Secretary of the Interior’s Standards, page 2.5, number 1. “...or be placed in new use that requires minimal change to the defining characteristics of the building.”

Rear elevation of the addition is not incongruous with the neighborhood with the exception of the sidelights on the doors on the rear elevation, please revisit the fenestration per guideline 6.12.

The site plan needs additional details including the AC unit placement/screening, trash locations, fencing, etc.

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 (STDL) windows and doors.

Revised Proposal – March 11, 2020
- Window design changed on right elevation
- Windows noted to be re-used and relocated on the left elevation

Revised Proposal – August 12, 2020
- Historic windows retained on both right and left elevations
- Main entry moved to ground level on right elevation
- Roof changes on left elevation

STAFF ANALYSIS:
Staff has the following comments about the proposal:
1. Label size (footprint) of the addition building on plans.
2. Dimensions of porch supports on addition?
3. Location of HVAC units?
4. Location of trash receptacles?
5. Minor changes may be approved by staff (HVAC location/screening, porch support dimensions, etc.)

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:
No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED
1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: HADEN
Mr. Henningson moved to continue this application for Windows – do not replace original windows per Guidelines 4.14, number 1, 2, 3. Add a stone casing around the casement windows that flank the stained glass. The windows above the stained-glass, restudy to move from a paired window to a single window. Provide a window protection plan for the stained-glass windows. Provide more detail on the space between the stained-glass windows and the side lights. There is also a restudy on the side lights that flank the stained-glass windows and a restudy of the light pattern. Roof – Restudy the balcony location and retain a portion of the original roof and railing. Include a three-dimensional model with views from the street. On the rear elevation, do not add the brick pilaster detail. On the new construction, restudy the balcony structure, specifically the angle braces are out of character. On the site plan, add HVAC location, locations of the trash and the screening detail. New drawings need to accurately reflect the original building and what’s being proposed.

VOTE: 7/0
AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, HADEN, HENNINGSON, PARATI
NAYS: NONE

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR ADDITION/ FENESTRATION CHANGES CONTINUED.
APPLICATION:
HDCRMI 2020-00099, 1547 MERRIMAN AVENUE, (PID 11909710) – REPLACEMENT WINDOWS

This application was continued from the March 11, 2020 meeting for the following item: Additional information documenting the existing conditions of all windows.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing structure is a 1-story, brick American Small House with Colonial Revival elements constructed in 1940. Architectural features include 6/6 wood windows, a partial-width engaged front porch supported by square wood columns, wood vent details, and a brick chimney. The lot size is approximately 50’ x 117’.

PROPOSAL
The proposed project is to replace the original 6/6 double-hung wood windows. The proposed new windows will be double-hung, aluminum clad windows, 6/6 windows.

Revised Proposal – August 12, 2020
• Additional photo documentation of windows provided.

STAFF ANALYSIS:
Staff has the following comments about 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 Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED
1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: BARTH
Mr. Henningson moved to continue this application so the applicant can find a reputable company/contractor to evaluate all windows on a case-by-case basis to determine which ones can be repaired versus replaced.

VOTE: 7/0
AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, HADEN, HENNINGSON, PARATI
NAYS: NONE

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR WINDOW REPLACEMENT CONTINUED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:
ABSENT: Jordan, Muryn, Rumsch, Walker
APPLICATION:
HDCRMI 2019-00746, 1911 S. Mint Street, (PID 11907603) – ADDITION

This application as continued from the July 8, 2020 meeting for the following item:
Change windows to a column panel detail that extends along the front, left, and right side of the porch.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing structure is a brick American Small House built c. 1940. The house has a few minimal Colonial Revival/Tudor elements as visible in the 6/6 window configuration and the front gable roof detailing. The metal awnings and metal porch rails/posts appear to be a later 1960s additions.

PROPOSAL:
The proposed project includes three main elements:
1. Replacement of all existing double-hung wood windows with new double-hung wood windows.
2. Fenestration changes to an infilled front porch. Changing the existing window size and configuration and installing new casement windows.
3. A small addition at the right/rear corner of the house.

There are no impacts to mature canopy trees. No change to the rear yard permeability.

Revised Proposal – July 8, 2020
• Revised front and left elevations provided.

Revised Proposal – August 12, 2020
• Revised front and left elevations provided.

STAFF ANALYSIS:
Staff has the following comments about the proposal:
1. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:
No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED 1st: HINDMAN 2nd: BARTH
Ms. Hindman moved to approve this application as drawn for Option #1 because it is not incongruous and complies with the Secretary of Interior Standards guidelines number 9 and 10.

VOTE: 7/0  AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, HADEN, HENNINGSON, PARATI

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.
ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:
ABSENT: Jordan, Muryn, Rumsch, Walker

APPLICATION:
HDCRMI 2020-00107, 601 W. KINGSTON AVENUE, 601 WEST BOULEVARD, 541 W. WORTHINGTON AVENUE, (PID 11907207, 11907208, 11907427, 11907428) – ALTERNATE MATERIAL REQUEST

This application was continued from the July 8, 2020 meeting for the following item:
Provide a mockup detail on the existing brick building, above the first-floor window and porch entry area; to show the details that were specified and to show the water proofing detail.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The new construction of multi-family buildings was approved by the HDC on March 14, 2018 for the north site. The south site construction was approved on August 8, 2018. Approved materials include brick and decorative areas (trim bands, cornice) of GFRC.

PROPOSAL:
The applicant is proposing to use a thin-coat of EIFS applied over brick instead of the GRFC.

Revised Proposal – July 8, 2020
• EIFS mock-up panel created and installed at the project site.

Revised Proposal – August 12, 2020
• Stucco applied to building and photos provided

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:
The Commission will determine if the proposed material is not incongruous with the district.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:
No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED  1st: HADEN  2nd: HENNINGSON
Mr. Haden moved to approve this application as presented in the mock-up and that these details and this material will be used anywhere the GFRC is shown on the approved drawings.

Mr. Henningson made a friendly amendment to include that the stucco recreates the original detail that was in the approved plans.

VOTE:  7/0  AYES:  BARTH, BONAPARTE, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, HADEN, HENNINGSON, PARATI

NAYS:  NONE

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR ALTERNATE MATERIAL APPROVED.
APPLICATION:
HDCCMI 2020-00124, 215 E. WORTHINGTON AVENUE, (PID 12105402) – OUTDOOR SEATING 
AREA/SIGNAGE

This application as continued from the July 8, 2020 meeting for the following items:
• Bring a sample or provide multiple photographs of the planter being proposed to include the colors 
that will be used.
• Provide a list of all the plant material anticipated to be used to ensure year-around planting in the 
planters.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing structure is a one-story brick commercial structure built c. 1956. The building is a mix of 
concrete block with a brick façade, and all masonry is painted. The lot size is approximately 56’ x 115’. 
The building is at the edge of the Dilworth local historic district, located just off of South Boulevard. An 
existing historic pole sign is to be re-used per an earlier decision by the Commission. Adjacent 
structures are one- and two-story commercial buildings and single-family houses. The parcel was 
formerly zoned B-1 and was rezoned to TOD-UC in September 2019. TOD is considered a Corridor 
Zoning District. The HDC Design Guidelines for Signage are the same for B-1 and Corridor Zoning 
districts.

PROPOSAL:
The proposed project is the installation of an outdoor seating area in front of the building to replace a 
front yard parking lot. The existing asphalt parking area will be changed to a stamped concrete patio. 
Large, moveable, fiberglass planter boxes measuring approximately 18” x 48” will be installed along the 
edges of the patio to define the space. The planters will feature a greenscreen trellis panel measuring 
36” x 46”. The total height of the planters and greenscreens from grade is approximately 58”. There will 
be two (2) Painted steel 4” tube posts approximately 8’ in height installed at the front edge of the patio 
as anchors for strung café lights. Lighting on the building is not changing.

New signage for the building is also proposed. An existing historic pole sign is required to be used per an 
earlier decision by the Commission, and the hanging sign measures approximately 25” x 41 ½” (7.2 
square feet). In addition to the pole sign the applicant is proposing the addition of two wall signs with 
each measuring approximately 93” x 56 ¾” (36.5 square feet). One sign will be located on the front 
elevation over the entry doors and the second sign will be located on the left elevation over an entry 
door. Total wall proposed wall signage is 73 square feet. When combined with the required pole sign, 
total signage on the property measures approximately 80 square feet.

HDC Decision – July 8, 2020
• The commission approved the twinkle lights, the patio area paving as well as the pole sign and one 
front wall sign to be externally lit in the sizes proposed at the July 8th HDC meeting.
Revised Proposal – August 12, 2020

• Additional information about the planter colors and size and planting material is provided.

STAFF ANALYSIS:
Staff has the following comments about the proposal:
1. The proposal is not incongruous with the District, is completely reversible and meets the applicable Secretary of the Interiors Standards, #1, 2, 9 and 10, and removes a grandfathered, unscreened front parking lot.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:
No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED
1st: HADEN 2nd: BARTH
Mr. Haden moved to approve the planter that is submitted without the green screen and the submitted plant material of the Emerald Green False Cyprus. It should be at least 24 inches tall when it goes in, and they need to assure that the plants will be properly maintained over time.

VOTE: 7/0
AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, HADEN, HENNINGSON, PARATI

NAYS: NONE

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR PLANTER AND PLANT MATERIAL APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:
ABSENT: Jordan, Muryn, Rumsch, Walker

APPLICATION:
HDCRMA 2020-00156, 1424 EUCLID AVENUE, (PID 12302908) - ADDITION

This application as continued from the July 8, 2020 meeting for the following items:
• Restudy the condition in the rear, because on the second story on the left and right elevations, the walls are coplanar.
• Hardie Artisan specified on the plans.
• Windows not to be replaced with the exception of the windows on the original building on the gable ends, to use casement windows that look like double-hung windows without increasing the window opening size, and do not add a new window opening on the right elevation.
• Shingle roof on the dormers on the front, and a light pattern that mimics or complements the original windows.
• No apron trim on windows in siding.

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing building is a 1.5 story Colonial Revival house constructed c. 1936. Architectural features include front porch featuring a classical pedimented gable with eave returns, a fanlight window,
decorative molding, and square fluted columns. The front porch is screened. The house is painted brick. The lot size is approximately 70’ x 190’. Adjacent structures are one and two story single and multi-family structures.

**PROPOSAL:**
The proposal is an addition of two small dormers on the front elevation and a rear addition. For the rear addition, the main ridge will not be raised, a new cross-gable will be added approximately 24’ behind the main ridge. The new cross-gable ridge will be approximately 3’ taller than the main ridge. Materials include Sierra Pacific aluminum clad windows and doors with ¾” Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL) and spacer bars in a 6/1 pattern to match the existing original windows. New dormers will have fiber cement lap siding and casing. Both the dormers and the rear addition will have a standing seam metal roof. The proposed project also includes the replacement of all original 6/1 double-hung wood windows. There are no impacts to mature canopy trees.

*Revised Proposal – August 12, 2020*
- Revised rear and left elevations.
- Dormers – roof changed to shingles, window light pattern changed
- Windows labeled to be restored; windows in gable ends changed to casement for egress
- Window trim in siding updated.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**
Staff has the following comments about the proposal:
1. Thickness of the fiber cement siding.
2. Minor revisions may be reviewed by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**
No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION: APPROVED**

1st: HINDMAN   2nd: LINEBERGER
Ms. Hindman moved to approve the application as drawn because it addresses all the issues from our continuation on July 8th and it is not incongruous.

**VOTE:** 7/0

**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, HADEN, HENNINGSON, PARATI

**NAYS:** NONE

**DECISION:**
APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED.

**APPLICATION:**
HDCADMRM 2019-00738, 1223 BELGRAVE PLACE, (PID 12310309) – ACCESSORY BUILDING

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**
ABSENT: Jordan, Muryn, Rumsch, Walker
With the 2.5-inch difference in height to the main house, the accessory building is not secondary. The character of the proposed accessory building is not compatible with the main house, with a focus on the dormers and massing.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**
The existing structure is a one-story brick ranch constructed in 1951. The lot measures approximately 100’ x 200’. This section of Dilworth is more suburban in character with longer blocks, larger and non-uniform lots, and deeper setbacks. Adjacent structures along the block are various types of one- and two-story single-family homes. A rear addition and window replacement were approved in 2013 and the front dormers and front portico were approved in 2015.

**PROPOSAL:**
The proposed project is an Accessory Building (the driveway, pool, tree removal is all being reviewed at the staff level). Design was inspired by the Accessory Structure at 1201 Belgrave Place (HDCRMI-2018-00573) approved by the Commission in December 2018.

- Primary structure height varies from 17.7’ to 20.3’ (Average height is 19’).
- Per Zoning Administration Staff: the tallest point may be used when measuring the height of a primary structure to meet the requirement that accessory buildings cannot exceed the height of the primary structure.
- Accessory Building Height: 20’-1 ½”, as measured from grade to ridge (including the 2’ excavation).
- Accessory Building Footprint: 24’ x 30’
- Materials: Traditional to match the primary structure.

**Revised Proposal – August 12, 2020**
- Post-construction, the building will sit approximately 2’ shorter than the ridge of the main house.
- Dormers/massing redesign to better match main house.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**
1. Minor changes may be approved by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**
No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:** APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS

Mr. Henningson moved to approve this application per Guidelines 8.9, number 3. The garage is secondary to the primary structure because it leverages an approximate two-foot reduction in grade. The applicant should fix the coplanar condition between the second story and the first story and move in the second story wall 12 inches. The rear dormer should be moved in 12 inches to fix the coplanar condition between the walls on all three sides.

Ms. Hindman made a friendly amendment that the garage door and entry door specifications be submitted to staff for approval.
APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY STRUCTURE APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

NEW CASES

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:
ABSENT: Jordan, Muryn, Rumsch, Walker
Ms. Hindman reused herself for the next application.

APPLICATION:
HDCRMI 2020-00387, 209 S. SUMMIT AVENUE, (PID 07323211) – WINDOW REPLACEMENT

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing structure is a one-story Craftsman bungalow constructed in 1935. The building has partial width front porch with brick piers and square wood columns. Other architectural features include double-hung 6/1 and 8/1 wood windows, wood lap siding with corner boards, wood brackets and exposed rafter tails. All existing masonry (foundation, chimney) is painted. Adjacent structures are single-family and multi-family residential. Lot size is approximately 54’ x 185’.

PROPOSAL:
The project is the total replacement of window sashes for the entire the house due to high levels of lead contamination. The applicant has supplied information regarding the condition of the windows and details of the proposed sash kits which will be full wood with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL), replicating the existing patterns and dimensions. Areas of rotten trim will be repaired/replaced to match existing.

STAFF ANALYSIS:
Staff has the following comments about the proposal:
1. The Commission will determine if the proposed replacement window and trim, where required, meet the Guidelines.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:
No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVED
1st: HADEN 2nd: BONAPARTE
Mr. Haden moved to approve the window replacement with the following; this is an exception to our standard procedure and our rulings, of Guidelines 4.12 windows shall not be replaced. The exception is documented evidence presented by the applicant and the City of Charlotte’s staff who is handling her application for lead abatement assistance. The evidence shows the presence of lead in both the interior, exterior and the soil far exceed the standards that are allowable or okay. In addition to the testimony
provided by Ms. Lamy regarding the amount of lead to be allowed in window sills and in the soil. The HDC staff will work with the staff of the housing group to determine a better substitute window replacement kit that suitably matches the existing in design, dimension and material function and we are only approving the moveable parts, not the trim, according to guidelines 4.12, 4.13 and 4.14.

VOTE: 5/1

AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, LINEBERGER, HADEN, PARATI

NAYS: HENNINGSON

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR WINDOW REPLACEMENT APPROVED.

ABSSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:
ABSSENT: Jordan, Muryn, Rumsch, Walker
Ms. Hindman returned to the meeting for the next application.

APPLICATION:
HDCCMA 2019-00827, 1316 THOMAS AVENUE, (PID 08117305) – NEW CONSTRUCTION

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The proposed project site is currently a vacant lot being used for parking. It is located at the edge of the Plaza Midwood local historic district. Lot size is approximately 50’ x 150.

PROPOSAL:
The proposal is the construction of a new commercial building. Proposed height as measured from grade to ridge is 26’-9”. Materials include James Hardie Artisan lap siding with an 8 ¼” reveal, Hardie corner boards and frieze trim, and areas of Hardie shingles in the gables. Porch columns proposed to be 8” square wood. Windows proposed to be aluminum clad casements with Simulated True Divided Lights (STDL).

STAFF ANALYSIS:
Staff has the following comments about the proposal:
1. Fiber cement shake siding has not been approved by the Commission due to dimensions, shadowlines, and uniform appearance.
2. HVAC location/screening.
3. 8’ tall privacy fence.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:
No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: CONTINUED 1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: BARTH
Mr. Henningson moved to continue this application based on Guideline 6.6, number 2, the proposed height of the building should be no taller than the tallest historic building on the block with a 360-degree angle view and guideline 6.1, the preamble, which speaks to context, as well as, commercial on the
fringe whereby scale reducing techniques should be used to help minimize the impact on the neighborhood.

**VOTE:** 5/2  
**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, LINEBERGER, HENNINGSON, PARATI  
**NAYS:** HADEN, HINDMAN,

**DECISION:** APPLICATION FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION CONTINUED.

---

**ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:**  
ABSENT: Jordan, Muryn, Rumsch, Walker

**APPLICATION:**  
HDCRMI 2020-00386, 1539 MERRIMAN AVENUE, (PID 11909708) – ADDITION/Front PORCH CHANGES

**EXISTING CONDITIONS:**  
The existing structure is a house constructed in 1940. Major alterations, including a second level addition, were made to the house in recent years. The site is a corner lot at Merriman Avenue and Larch Street. Current height is approximately 30' from finished floor to ridge. Lot size is approximately 64’ x 118’. A re-design was approved by the full HDC on July 11, 2018 (HDCRMA-2018-00212) and is currently under construction.

**PROPOSAL:**  
The proposal is changes to the approved re-design of the front porch. The applicant is requesting to extend the front porch to wrap-around the left elevation, one-bay deep.

**STAFF ANALYSIS:**  
Staff has the following comments about the proposal:
1. The porch addition helps this corner-lot structure relate to the side street better.
2. Minor changes may be approved by staff.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**  
No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION:** APPROVE WITH CONDITIONS  
1st: BONAPARTE  2nd: HADEN

Ms. Bonaparte moved to approve this application with the following conditions: accurate plans are submitted for staff to review; left side elevation matches slide 288 and that staff make sure the missing window on the left side elevation is included.

**VOTE:** 7/0  
**AYES:** BARTH, BONAPARTE, HADEN, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER, HENNINGSON, PARATI  
**NAYS:** NONE
DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR ADDITION APPROVED WITH CONDITIONS.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:
ABSENT: Jordan, Muryn, Rumsch, Walker

APPLICATION:
HDCRMI 2020-00196, 1308 LEXINGTON AVENUE, (PID 12309210) – ACCESSORY BUILDING

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing structure is a 1.5 story Tudor Revival brick cottage constructed in 1947. Architectural details include the arched portico, prominent chimney on the front elevation, one-story side wing and 6/6 widows. As compared to other lots in this section of Dilworth, the lot size is small and irregular measuring approximately 90’ x 80’ x 107’ x 132’. According to the National Register nomination, the garage was constructed in 1950.

PROPOSAL:
The proposal is the demolition of an existing garage and the construction of a new 1.5 story accessory building that contains a carport on the first level and heated living space on the second level. The project will meet all required zoning setbacks. Materials are wood lap siding and trim and a brick foundation to match the existing primary structure. The proposed building height is 21’-11”. The height of the primary structure is 23’-2”.

STAFF ANALYSIS:
Staff has the following comments about the proposal:
1. Rear elevation massing and scale; co-planer two story walls.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:
No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: APPROVE
1st: HADEN  2nd: LINEBERGER
Mr. Haden moved to approve this application as submitted.

VOTE: 5/2
AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HADEN, HINDMAN, LINEBERGER,
NAYS: HENNINGSON, PARATI

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR ACCESSORY BUILDING APPROVED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:
ABSENT: Jordan, Muryn, Rumsch, Walker
Ms. Hindman reused herself for the next application.

APPLICATION:
EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing structure is a one-story Craftsman bungalow house constructed in 1924. Architectural features include a side gable roof and partial width engaged front porch that wraps around the left side of the house. Siding material is brick with wood shake shingle in the front porch gables. Adjacent structures are 1-1.5 story single family houses and duplexes. The lot size is 56’ x 150’.

PROPOSAL:
The proposal is for a new front walkway. The existing walk is approximately 3’ wide and concrete. The new walk is proposed to be herringbone brick pattern with a brick border and proposed to be 5’ wide to be even with the front steps. If the existing walk were to be repaired or replaced to match existing in dimensions and material, then it would be an Administrative review. Since the applicant is requesting a change in material and to expand the width, the project requires Commission review.

STAFF ANALYSIS:
1. Minor revisions can be reviewed by staff.

SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:
No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

MOTION: DENIED
1st: HENNINGSON 2nd: HADEN
Mr. Henningson moved to deny this application per Guideline 8.2, number 1 retain existing historic walkways and number 7, repair damaged areas with materials that match the original paving in color, size, texture, and finish

VOTE: 5/1
AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HADEN, HENNINGSON, PARATI,
NAYS: LINEBERGER

DECISION:
APPLICATION FOR ADDITION DENIED.

ABSENT | RECUSE | LEFT MEETING:
ABSENT: Jordan, Muryn, Rumsch, Walker
Ms. Hindman returned to the meeting for the next application.

APPLICATION:
HDCRMI 2020-00226, 251 W. KINGSTON AVENUE, (PID 11907911) – ALTERNATE MATERIALS

EXISTING CONDITIONS:
The existing structure is a two-story bungalow constructed in 1946 with a major addition (2007) that pre-dates the designation of Wilmore as a local historic district. New wood siding was installed on the front and rear of the house during the 2007 addition. Lot dimensions are approximately 50’ x 170’. Adjacent structures are 1-2 story single and multi-family buildings. The project is an after-the-fact request. A portion of wood siding on the rear elevation has already been replaced with new fiber cement siding.
**PROPOSAL:**
The proposed project is to remove the replacement wood siding and install fiber-cement siding.

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

1. Fiber cement siding with a textured faux-wood grain has not been previously approved by the Commission.
2. The Commission will determine if the proposed replacement siding and trim, where required, meet the Guidelines.

**SPEAKERS [FOR | AGAINST]:**
No one accepted Ms. Parati’s invitation to speak either for or against this application.

**MOTION: DENIED**
1st: BARTH  
2nd: HADEN
Mr. Barth moved to deny this application based on the applicant’s desire to propose alternative materials to the front and back elevations on the historic home in relation to the Department of Interior Standards, section 2.5, number 6, as well as our guidelines 4.11 on trim.

**VOTE:** 6/0  
AYES: BARTH, BONAPARTE, HADEN, HENNINGSON, LINEBERGER, PARATI

NAYS: NONE

**DECISION:**
APPLICATION FOR ALTERNATE MATERIALS DENIED.

Ms. Parati adjourned the meeting at 7:20
Linda Keich, Clerk to the Historic District Commission